DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 293 936 UD 026 065

AUTHOR Welch, Finis; And Others

TITLE New Evidence on School Desegregation.
INSTITUTION Unicon Research Corp., Santa Monica, CA.
SPONS AGENCY Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jun 87
NOTE 180p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Declining Enrollment; *Desegregation Plans; Elementary Secondary Education; *Enrollment Rate; Magnet Schools; *Minority Groups; Program Effectiveness; *Racial Balance; School Demography; *School Desegregation; School Districts; *White Students

ABSTRACT

The object of this study was to compile data for a broadly based sample of 125 school districts showing enrollment by race between 1967 and 1985. The sample represents about 20 percent of national enrollment in public schools in 1968 and close to half of all minority enrollment. Data are presented to support an analysis of the relationships between desegregation plans, levels of integration, and enrollment trends. Nationwide patterns in enrollment and desegregation efforts are summarized. The findings include the following: (1) segregation declined in 117 of the 125 districts; (2) eight districts were more segregated in 1984 or 1985 than in 1968, but five of these had not implemented a plan; (3) plans that used pairing and clustering, particularly in combination with rezoning, resulted in more desegregation than other types of plans; (4) white enrollment showed a pronounced decline; (5) some of the decline in white enrollment was associated with plans that used bussing; (6) in spite of these declines, 74 districts increased the exposure of minorities to white pupils; and (7) in six districts white enrollment increased. Demographic and statistical data are presented in tables and appendices include a bibliography of desegregation plan documents consulted for this study listed alphabetically by state and district. (VM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

3-11-88

ED293936

DE GRE GA TION

NEW EVIDENCE ON SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

Finis Welch and

Audrey Light

With the Assistance of

Frederick Dong and

J. Michael Ross

Prepared for the

United States Commission

on Civil Rights

Clearinghouse Publication 92

June 1987

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

UD026065

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is an independent, bipartisan agency first established by Congress in 1957 and reestablished in 1983. It is directed to:

- Investigate complaints alleging that citizens are being deprived of their right to vote by reason of their race, color, religion, sex, age, disability, or national origin, or by reason of fraudulent practices.
- Study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting discrimination or a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution because of race, color, religion, sex, age, disability, or national origin, or in the administration of justice.
- Appraise Federal laws and policies with respect to discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, sex, age, disability, or national origin, or in the administration of justice.
- Serve as a national clearinghouse for information in respect to discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, sex, age, disability, or national origin.
- Submit reports, findings, and recommendations to the President and the Congress.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Clarence M. Pendleton, Jr., *Chairman*
Murray Friedman, *Vice Chairman*
William Barclay Allen
Mary Frances Berry
Esther Gonzalez-Arroyo Buckley
Robert A. Destro
Francis S. Guess
Blandina Cardenas Ramirez

Susan J. Prado, Acting *Staff Director*

NEW EVIDENCE ON SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

Finis Welch and Audrey Light

With the Assistance of
Frederick Dong and J. Michael Ross

Unicon Research Corporation
10801 National Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90064

Prepared for the
United States Commission on Civil Rights
Clearinghouse Publication 92

June 1987

Preface

The objective of this study was to compile data for all schools in a broadly based sample of 125 public school districts, showing enrollment by race between 1967 and 1985. A large part of the data was collected earlier and has been used in several studies relating enrollment trends to desegregation programs. This project augmented the existing data by filling in additional years and adding information on desegregation programs. The data are intended to support analyses of relationships between desegregation techniques, levels of integration, and enrollment trends. Although a detailed analysis is beyond the scope of the current study, some of the relationships are described in broad terms. In addition, this report provides details about the data and summarizes nationwide patterns in enrollment, integration levels, and desegregation efforts.

The research was funded by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (Contract Number CR30050745). Systems Development Corporation (SDC) was the original contractor; the contract was novated to Unicon Research Corporation on July 1, 1985. Finis Welch, Audrey Light and Frederick Dong are members of Unicon's research staff. J. Michael Ross served as a consultant for the collection of desegregation plan data. Numerous other members of Unicon's staff contributed to the study. In particular, Eanswythe Grabowski supervised the data processing and Melanie Sterling supervised the collection, coding, entering and cleaning of data.

We are indebted to everyone who assisted in this project. School district representatives provided us with enrollment data. David Armor and David Morgan provided documents describing desegregation plans for some of the districts. Christine Rossell reviewed the desegregation plan data. The project's Advisory Committee—Eric Hanushek (chairman), Tom Cook, Christopher Jencks, and Christine Rossell—reviewed an earlier draft and provided helpful comments. David Armor and June O'Neill also provided useful comments. We would also like to thank Eric Hanushek and Peter Mieszkowski for an earlier review that helped sustain the project.

We are responsible for any errors. Opinions are our own and do not necessarily reflect opinions or policies of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

Unicon Research Corporation
10801 National Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90064
213-470-4466

Contents

Preface ii

Highlights v

Section		Page
1.	Introduction and Summary	1
2.	Are Schools Desegregating?	9
3.	Techniques Used For School Desegregation	21
	1. Six Standard Techniques: Definitions and Examples	23
	2. Landmark Court Cases: the Evolution of 3. Desegregation Techniques	28
4.	Sources and Characteristics of the Data	31
	1. The Unicon/SDC Sample	31
	2. Enrollment Data	33
	3. Desegregation Plan Data	34
5.	Enrollment and Integration Levels: Overview	37
	1. Measuring Levels of Integration	37
	2. Trends in the Data	39
6.	Changes in White Enrollment and the Segregation Index Surrounding Implementation of Major Plans ..	45
	1. Major Plan Classification	45
	2. An Illustration of the Calculations	48
	3. Changes in White Enrollment and the Segregation Index	51
	4. Additional Comments	62
7.	Suggestions for Further Research	69

Appendices

A.	Data For Selected Metropolitan Areas and All Districts in the Sample	71
B.	Availability and Use of Data By Year	99
C.	Bibliography for Desegregation Plans	115

Highlights

This report addresses several questions:

- Have school districts desegregated?
- Have desegregation efforts influenced the movement of students out of desegregating districts?
- Has enrollment loss of white students nullified the effects of desegregation plans?

To answer these questions, the study assembled a large data base consisting of school level enrollment data for 125 school districts along with data on the types of desegregation plans implemented in each district. The districts chosen for analysis include almost all large districts with a 20 to 90 percent minority population plus a representative sample of smaller districts.

The sample accounted for about 20 percent of national public school enrollment in 1968 and close to half of all minority enrollment. The study spans the period 1967 to 1985.

To answer the question whether schools desegregated, the report uses an index of dissimilarity (or segregation) which shows the extent of racial imbalance among schools. (The more that the proportion minority in the individual schools diverges from the district-wide proportion, the greater the degree of segregation.) The following results were found:

- Segregation declined in 117 of the 125 districts. Of these, 100 districts experienced a decline in the dissimilarity index of more than 0.11 points (in a scale of zero to one). The sharpest declines in segregation occurred during the period of implementation, 51 districts did experience some resegregation, but in most cases, not enough to erode all of the initial gains made.
- Eight districts were more segregated in 1984 or 1985 than they were in 1968, but of these, five had not implemented a plan.
- Plans that used pairing and clustering—particularly in combination with rezoning—had larger desegregative effects than other plan types. (These plans usually involve busing.) Southern districts experience greater reductions in segregation levels than did nonsouthern districts. Desegregation plans implemented in count-wide districts led to dramatic reductions in segregation levels.

In order to determine whether desegregation efforts led to losses in white enrollment, the study looked at departures from the trend in white enrollment. This was necessary because white enrollments were declining generally during the period under study due to declining birth rates as well as to migration patterns that might not have been related to school desegregation. The study found the following patterns:

- White enrollment shows a pronounced decline during the period of plan implementation. Enrollment losses accelerate sharply in the year of plan implementation departing significantly from the prior trend. In the years following implementation, the white loss rate tapers off again. The pattern leaves little doubt that there is an enrollment response to desegregation.

- Plans that used pairing and clustering (busing) were associated with much larger losses in white enrollment than other plans, possibly, because they require that greater distances be traveled. County-wide districts experienced less enrollment loss than did other types of districts, presumably because they are concentrated in the Sunbelt and because they encompass cities and suburbs alike.

Since white enrollment loss was significant following plan implementation, it is natural to inquire whether the losses were so great as to trigger more racial isolation than before. To answer this question, the study looked at an index of exposure that measures the average proportion of classmates who are white in schools minorities attend. The study notes the following findings:

- In 74 districts out of the 125 studied, the exposure of minorities to whites increased despite a decline in the percentage of students who are white.

- In six districts, white representation increased as did minority exposure to whites.

- In 45 districts, the proportion of students who are white fell, and minority exposure to whites fell as well. Twenty-five of these districts had weak plans or no plans. The remaining twenty districts experienced unusually sharp reductions in white enrollment and had implemented plans that reduced segregation. It is possible, therefore, that the implementation of a desegregation plan in these twenty districts actually

resulted in an increase in racial isolation. The authors caution, however, that more analysis would be needed before such a conclusion could be drawn.

1. Introduction and Summary

In *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), the Supreme Court ruled that racially segregated schools are inherently unequal and practices fostering them are, therefore, unconstitutional. The decision launched the modern civil rights movement and school desegregation became one of the leading issues of the 1960s and 1970s. Disagreement over what constitutes an illegal segregative practice and what remedies to use polarized communities and challenged the legal system.

Although the battles have subsided, school desegregation remains a vital issue. By pausing to examine the record, we have the opportunity to enhance future policy and resolve questions about the past. Was desegregation the best tool for redressing educational inequality? Once dual school systems were eliminated, could the additional resources employed by desegregation programs have been put to better use—and would they have, if desegregation had not been undertaken? What is the impact of desegregation on educational achievement? What portion of the improved career outcomes of minorities can be attributed to integrated education? These are important questions that deserve to be examined, although the answers will undoubtedly remain elusive.

This study addresses a more modest set of questions. To what extent has desegregation been accomplished? How many students actually attend integrated schools? How has this number changed over time? What desegregation techniques have the greatest impact on the level of integration? What techniques are associated with the greatest changes in white enrollment? Some of the issues have been explored previously, but research has been constrained by the lack of comprehensive data.

A number of previous studies examined large samples of school districts, but they concentrated on one issue: Does desegregation reduce white enrollment? The Coleman study[1] was the first, and it found white flight that is most pronounced in large central city districts. Coleman's result proved to be controversial and was initially disputed,[2] but a second wave of studies (Farley and Wurdock; Rossell; Armor; Farley, Richards and Wurdock;

[1]James S. Coleman, Sara D. Kelly and John A. Moore, "Trends in School Segregation, 1968–73," The Urban Institute, 1975.

[2]The first wave of responses to the Coleman study include Reynolds Farley, "School Integration and White Flight," Population Studies Center, University of Michigan, 1975; and Christine H. Rossell, "School Desegregation and White Flight," *Political Science Quarterly* 90 (1975–76).

Wilson)[3] confirmed the qualitative finding. Although most studies of desegregation programs agree that they are generally accompanied by reduced white enrollment, there is no agreement about the extent or the duration of enrollment losses.[4]

These studies represent the most rigorous analyses of white flight, but they also illustrate deficiencies in the empirical literature. First, they are dated. The Coleman study used Office of Civil Rights surveys for 1968 through 1973. Subsequent studies used either the same data set or an updated version, but the most recent (Armor) extends only through 1977. Second, longterm trends in white enrollment have been largely ignored. Only Rossell (1977), Armor (for a sample of 22 districts), Farley, Richards and Wurdock, and Wilson examined enrollment changes in the post-implementation period. Third, it has not been possible to distinguish between specific desegregation techniques such as rezoning, pairing and clustering, and magnets. Rossell and Wilson used broader measures of plan type such as the extent of student reassignment and whether plans were initiated by the school board or the court.

This project enhances the school desegregation literature by providing updated data. Enrollment data now extend from either 1967 or 1968 through 1984 or 1985 for almost all of the 125 school districts in the sample. Not only does the number of enrollment observations per school more than double, but later desegregation plans—which are more likely to occur in the North and to include magnet programs—can now be analyzed. In addition to providing enrollment data, the data base identifies the dates and nature of most desegregation plans implemented between 1968 and 1984.

This report also provides preliminary analysis of two issues. One concerns the resegregative response to desegregation programs—that is, the movement of students to another district or to private schools. Interdis-

[3]Reynolds Farley and Clarence Wurdock, "Can Governmental Policies Integrate Public Schools?" Population Studies Center, The University of Michigan, 1977; Christine H. Rossell, "The Unintended Impacts of Public Policy: School Desegregation and Resegregation," Institute of Policy Sciences, Duke University, 1978; David J. Armor, "White Flight, Demographic Transition, and the Future of School Desegregation," Paper presented at the American Sociological Association meetings, 1978; Reynolds Farley, Toni Richards and Clarence Wurdock, "School Desegregation and White Flight: An Investigation of Competing Models and Their Discrepant Findings," *Sociology of Education* 53 (July, 1980); Franklin D. Wilson, "The Impact of School Desegregation Programs on White Public-School Enrollment, 1968-1976," *Sociology of Education* 58 (July, 1985).

[4]Farley, Richards and Wurdock demonstrate that estimates are sensitive to model specification. Armor describes conceptual errors in the earlier studies by Farley and Rossell that cause their results to be at odds with subsequent research.

trict movement may reflect long-term demographic trends, or it may reflect "white flight." By looking at a district's enrollment by race over time, we can project what it might have been in the absence of a desegregation plan. If the actual enrollment differs from the projected enrollment, the magnitude of the deviation can be related to the type of desegregation plan employed.

The second issue concerns the effectiveness of various techniques in achieving desegregation. We track the integration level for a sample of 125 public school districts and measure changes before and after the implementation of desegregation plans. Average changes in integration levels are reported for specific types of programs and evaluated alongside coincident changes in white enrollment.

Before examining the districts in our sample, in Section 2 we look at nationwide trends in public school enrollment and the racial composition of urban and suburban areas.[5] Without relating trends to desegregation efforts, we ask whether three groups—blacks, Hispanics, and whites—are gaining exposure to one another. The first part of this section emphasizes the racial mix of students within districts, rather than enrollment patterns between schools. This perspective enables us to determine whether major areas of the country are so racially isolated that the issue of integration is moot. The second part of Section 2 describes, on a nationwide level, the distribution of black, Hispanic, and white students among schools.

- Our examination of 45 large metropolitan areas shows that, between 1968 and 1980, there was a decline in the proportion of students who are white[6] in central cities as well as in their suburbs. In both types of areas, the proportion of students who are black rose, as did the proportion that is Hispanic.

- Demographic trends account for much of this change. Falling birth rates reduced the number of white students by 21.5 percent between 1968 and 1980. At the same time, the white population shifted from central cities to suburbs and nonmetropolitan areas. The black population decreased slightly, while shifting away from central cities and nonmetropolitan areas and toward suburbs. The Hispanic population underwent less of a redistribution, but grew by more than 50 percent.

[5]In this section, suburbs are defined as all school districts (treated as a unit) in a metropolitan area, excluding the central city district.

[6]Throughout this report—unless noted otherwise—"white" excludes Hispanics and "minority" refers to all nonwhites. When not referring to data, "white" is implicitly regarded as the numerical majority.

- An examination of trends in private and parochial school enrollment reveals that the percentage of white students attending private schools *decreased* during the 1960s and the 1970s. This pattern did not hold in the South, where more white students attended private schools in 1980 than in 1970. We do not have data with which to compare private and public school enrollment in individual districts, so we cannot identify cases where desegregation efforts were accompanied by white flight into private schools. If white flight into private schools is a problem, however, it appears to be an isolated one. On a national level, whites are increasingly likely to attend public schools.

- In turning to school-level data, we find that the proportion of black students attending virtually all-minority schools fell from 62 to 30 percent between 1968 and 1980. At the same time, the proportion attending schools that are 26 to 75 percent white (integrated schools) rose from 17 to 44 percent. In short, black students were much more likely to attend school with whites in 1980 than they were in 1968.

- The pattern for Hispanics is quite different. Between 1968 and 1980, the proportion of Hispanics attending virtually all-minority schools increased slightly, from 18 to 21 percent. The proportion attending schools that are more than 75 percent white fell from 24 to 13 percent. It appears that Hispanic students had less exposure to white classmates in 1980 than they did in 1968.

In Section 3, we describe six major techniques used to desegregate schools: freedom of choice, magnets, voluntary transfers, neighborhood attendance zones, rezoning, and pairing and clustering. Each technique is defined, and specific examples are given. We also outline landmark court decisions to illustrate the impact of the courts on the type of desegregation plans used.

- Desegregation plans seen in the last 25 years are as diverse as the districts implementing them. Because districts vary in their geographic scope, metropolitan status, number of students, and racial composition, the feasibility of any given desegregation technique depends on where it is to be used.

- Community resistance may affect the nature of a desegregation plan. There is evidence that magnet programs and exemptions from reassignment (particularly for lower elementary school students) have been

added to plans to appease residents. In addition, resistance has led to phasing and delays in implementation.

- Changing legal precedent has had an unmistakable impact on the choice of desegregation techniques. Between the mid 1960s and the mid 1980s, desegregation efforts swept from the *de jure* segregated southern districts to the *de facto* segregated nonsouthern districts. In the late 1960s, voluntary measures (namely, freedom of choice) were replaced by pairing and clustering and rezoning. After the *Swann* decision was handed down in 1971, these mandatory plans increased in scope. Toward the late 1970s, voluntary plans returned, and we see many districts complement or replace their rezoning and pairing and clustering schemes with magnet programs.

Section 4 describes the criteria used to select our sample of 125 school districts. Because the sample includes most of the nation's largest school districts, it accounts for 20 percent of national public school enrollment in 1968. The 125 districts are located in all regions of the country, and encompass cities of various sizes as well as suburban and rural areas.

Section 4 also describes the sources and features of the data used for analysis. The data base contains two components: enrollment data and plan descriptions. The enrollment data report public school enrollment by ethnicity in every school in every district in the sample, for the period 1967 to 1985. Data are missing for some years, but in total we have over 200,000 observations and more than 2,000 district-year cells. The plan descriptions list the techniques and implementation years for almost 300 plans implemented by 109 districts.

Section 5 begins with a discussion of integration measures, and then examines the data for trends in integration and enrollments. A number of patterns are revealed:

- In general, total enrollment declined and minority representation increased during the period under study. The most dramatic losses of students occurred in northern cities. Most districts that experienced enrollment growth are located in the Sunbelt.

- Only ten districts gained white students during the period under study. The largest districts show the greatest losses of white students: of the nine districts with at least 100,000 white students in the first observed year, all but one lost over half of their whites by the last observed year.

- In examining integration levels, we find that districts that were initially highly segregated show the greatest improvements over time. Districts showing the largest reductions in segregation levels tend to be located in the South.

Section 6 combines both components of the data base to summarize relationships between plan design and changes in enrollment and integration levels. We identify each district's major plan and classify it according to the techniques used, the time of implementation (before or after the landmark *Swann* decision) and the scope (full or partial). Districts are classified by metropolitan character (small, medium and large urban, suburban, rural, or countywide), and region (South or nonsouth).

- The implementation of desegregation plans is usually associated with sharp reductions in segregation indices and white enrollment. The most pronounced changes occurred during the year of implementation, but there is evidence of a continuing effect in enrollment losses.

- The finding that white enrollment losses increased in the years surrounding implementation is not peculiar to the most stringent mandatory programs. In every stratification, there is evidence that desegregation coincided with reduced white enrollment. We find the largest losses among programs using pairing and clustering and the smallest losses among voluntary programs. Rezoning is intermediate, but responses are closer to voluntary programs than to pairing and clustering. We also find that the mixed plans that combined pairing and clustering with other techniques—either rezoning or magnets—are similar to those using pairing and clustering alone.

- Plans that used pairing and clustering—particularly in combination with rezoning—had larger desegregative effects than other plan types. Southern districts experienced greater reductions in segregation levels than did nonsouthern districts.

- Countywide districts experienced much less enrollment loss than did other types of districts, presumably because they are concentrated in the Sunbelt and because they encompass cities and suburbs alike. Desegregation plans implemented in countywide districts led to dramatic reductions in segregation levels. Not surprisingly, large urban districts are at the other extreme, with large losses in white enrollment and relatively small improvements in segregation levels.

- When we isolate plans that are of full scope—meaning they have the greatest effect on segregation levels—we do not find greater losses in white enrollment than are found for the sample as a whole. Among full plans, there is a dramatic distinction between those implemented before the *Swann* decision and those implemented after: holding plan type constant, post-Swann plans show much larger losses in white enrollment.

16

2. Are Schools Desegregating?

Many factors determine whether white and minority students attend school together. An important factor is the racial composition of the school district, which depends on the way populations are distributed across regions of the country and within metropolitan areas. Another factor is the number of students within a particular area attending public schools. The availability of private schools varies, and the propensity to attend private schools varies across races. Given the total enrollment of a public school district, remaining factors include residential patterns and desegregation programs which determine the mix of students within schools and within classrooms.

The effect of specific types of desegregation programs on interracial contact within districts is discussed in a later section. In this section, we consider integration at the national level. By examining trends in residential location and public school enrollment, we can assess how the potential for interracial contact has changed within three types of geographic regions: central cities, suburbs, and rural areas.

Attempts to desegregate the nation's schools came at a time when large cities were becoming increasing racially isolated. Between 1968 and 1980, school districts in the central cities of major metropolitan areas became overwhelmingly nonwhite, while suburban areas remained predominantly white (despite gaining minority students).[7] Whites accounted for 73.3 percent of all public elementary and secondary school students in 1980. In a sample of 45 large, urban school districts,[8] however, only one (Portland, Oregon) has a proportion of whites as large as for the nation as a whole. Whites are in the minority in 28 of the 45 districts; in eight districts, fewer than one student in five is white. By combining all noncentral districts within each urban area into a single pseudo-district, we find that at least 80 percent of all students are white in 28 of the 45 suburban composites. All 45 suburbs have a larger fraction of whites than the corresponding central city district.

Table 1 provides regional summaries of the phenomenon just described, and Table A1 (see Appendix A) lists the individual metropolitan areas. The enrollment data used in these tabulations identify students as black,

[7] As noted in the Introduction, Hispanics are counted as minorities rather than as whites.

[8] See the note following Table 1 for an explanation of this sample. The years 1968 and 1980 are compared because 1968 is the earliest year for which OCR data are available in machine readable form. Data are available for 1982, but they refer to a smaller, and possibly less representative, sample than do the 1980 data.

Hispanic, white, Asian, or Native American, so Asians and Native American students constitute the groups omitted in Table 1[9]

Table 1 reveals that the urban/suburban racial dichotomy applies to every region. In 1980, whites account for roughly two-thirds of public school enrollment in the South and West and about 80 percent in the remainder of the country. Yet whites represent less than 40 percent of the central cities' enrollment in every region. In the suburban pseudo-districts, every region except the West (where 71 percent of the students are white) has a white majority of at least three in every four students.

Table 1 also highlights the change in racial composition between 1968 and 1980. In every region, the proportion of white students has declined in central city *and* suburban districts.[10] During the same period, the proportions of black and Hispanic students *increased* in every type of district. The most dramatic increases have been among Hispanic students. In several types of districts—northeastern suburbs, North Central central cities and suburbs, and western central cities—the fraction of students who are Hispanic increased two- to three-fold.

To fully understand changes in urban/suburban racial composition, we must examine changes in the underlying population distributions. Total enrollment by race for the sample of 45 large, urban districts is shown in the last row of Table 2. The number of white students fell 21.5 percent between 1968 and 1980, while the number of blacks decreased 4.0 percent and the number of Hispanics increased 50.4 percent.[11]

Table 2 shows shifts in the distribution of each racial group. At the same time that white enrollment declined from 21.9 to 17.2 million, the white population was shifting. A larger proportion of whites lived in the South in 1980 than in 1968 and, in every region, a smaller proportion lived in central cities and a larger proportion lived in nonmetropolitan areas. The fraction of whites residing in suburbs increased nationally despite decreasing in the Northeast and West. Because the figures shown for 1980 represent

[9]They account for 0.8 percent of national enrollment in 1968 and for 1.6 percent in 1980. In the western states, they represent 2.9 percent of enrollment in 1968 and 7.8 percent in 1980.

[10]The proportion of white students has also declined in nonmetropolitan areas in every region except the South, where it has remained roughly constant.

[11]Nationwide, the number of white students fell 18 percent and the number of minority students increased by 19 percent (the number of blacks increased very slightly, so this reflects growth in the Hispanic population). By focusing on large urban areas, therefore, the decrease in white students and the growth among Hispanics is overstated relative to the national trend.

TABLE 1

Racial Composition of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools by Central City and Suburban Status, 1968 and 1980

(45 Large, Urban School Districts)				
	Central City Districts		Suburban Districts	
	1968	1980	1968	1930
Percentage of Students Who Are White				
Northeast	44.0	28.1	92.5	86.5
North Central	51.1	31.8	95.5	90.9
Southern	49.1	30.4	85.0	77.4
Western	62.9	38.0	85.2	71.1
Percentage of Students Who Are Black				
Northeast	38.6	44.8	6.5	9.5
North Central	45.4	58.5	3.6	6.2
Southern	44.7	57.0	10.8	14.2
Western	17.9	20.7	3.4	6.0
Percentage of Students Who Are Hispanic				
Northeast	16.2	23.9	0.8	2.4
North Central	3.2	7.9	0.6	1.3
Southern	5.8	11.0	3.7	5.9
Western	15.1	31.4	9.7	16.8

Note: The data for the individual metropolitan areas are listed in Appendix Table A1, which also shows the areas comprising each region. Enrollment data are from surveys conducted by the Office of Civil Rights (OCR). The surveys report enrollments (by individual schools) for a large sample of districts, and distinguish five racial groups (white, black, Hispanic, Asian, and Native American). The OCR surveys have been used for every large-scale quantitative study of school integration. The regional and national totals are taken from the intersection of merged 1968 and 1980 OCR files using 1980 sampling weights. The urban/suburban/nonmetropolitan divisions are more complex. The 1980 U.S. Census School District File (STF 3F) was used to identify the metropolitan status of school districts in SMSAs. This resulted in the exclusion of New England districts because they do not carry MSA flags. All nonmetropolitan districts in a region were retained as a group. Most metropolitan districts in the largest MSAs were retained. Exceptions include Rochester, New York because the merged OCR files do not have the central city school district. Long Island, New York was excluded because we could not identify a central city (other than New York, which appears in a separate SMSA). We also excluded all SMSAs whose central city district is a county unit (*e.g.*, the Florida districts).

TABLE 2

Distribution of Public Elementary and Secondary Students by Race and Metropolitan Status, 1968 and 1980 (45 Large, Urban School Districts)

	WHITE		BLACK		HISPANIC	
	1968	1980	1968	1980	1968	1980
FRACTION LIVING IN						
Northeast						
Central City	3.2	2.2	13.2	13.2	19.3	15.6
Suburb	7.6	7.5	2.5	3.2	1.1	1.8
Nonmetropolitan	11.0	11.4	2.4	2.8	1.9	3.3
Subtotal	21.8	21.1	18.1	19.2	22.3	20.7
North Central						
Central City	5.3	2.6	21.9	18.2	5.4	5.5
Suburb	15.9	16.1	2.8	4.2	1.7	2.0
Nonmetropolitan	13.5	14.3	2.0	1.9	1.6	1.5
Subtotal	34.7	33.0	26.7	24.3	8.7	9.0
South						
Central City	3.9	2.3	16.5	16.4	7.4	7.0
Suburb	7.6	10.2	4.5	7.1	5.4	6.6
Nonmetropolitan	13.7	16.6	26.0	23.7	8.1	8.1
Subtotal	25.2	29.1	47.0	47.2	20.9	21.7
West						
Central City	4.5	2.7	6.0	5.6	17.7	18.8
Suburb	10.7	10.4	2.0	3.4	19.6	20.8
Nonmetropolitan	3.1	3.7	0.3	0.3	10.8	9.1
Subtotal	18.3	16.8	8.3	9.3	48.1	48.7
Nationwide						
Central City	16.9	9.7	57.5	53.4	49.8	46.9
Suburb	41.8	44.2	11.8	17.9	27.8	31.1
Nonmetropolitan	41.3	46.1	30.7	28.7	22.4	22.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
TOTAL STUDENTS (in millions)	21.9	17.2	4.70	4.51	1.35	2.03

Source: 1968 and 1980 OCR Surveys.

fractions of a much smaller total, however, there were fewer whites living in suburbs, central cities, and nonmetropolitan areas. The only area where the *number* of whites increased is the southern suburbs, where there were 5.3 percent more whites in 1980 than in 1968.

Larger fractions of the black population resided in the Northeast, the South and, especially, the West in 1980 than in 1968. The fraction residing in central cities decreased (or stayed the same) and the fraction residing in suburbs increased for all regions; in the suburbs, the *number* of black students increased as well. The fraction of blacks living in nonmetropolitan areas decreased nationally, although the decline is specific to the North Central and Southern regions. In the other two regions, the *number* of blacks actually increased.

Among Hispanics, there was less of a redistribution across regions of the country than for the other groups. Because the number of Hispanics grew so dramatically between 1968 and 1980, every type of district in every region gained Hispanic students. Larger fractions of the Hispanic population resided in suburbs in 1980 than in 1968, while smaller fractions resided in nonmetropolitan areas in every region except the Northeast. Nationally, a smaller fraction of Hispanics lived in central cities, but the decreases were confined to the North Central and Southern regions.

The numbers in Table 2 explain what is behind the patterns revealed by Table 1. The central cities witnessed a 55 percent fall in the number of white students alongside an 11 percent decrease in blacks and a 42 percent increase in Hispanics. These numbers add to a decrease in the total number of central city students and a decrease in the fraction that is white. In the suburban districts, the number of white students fell by 17 percent, while the number of blacks rose by 45 percent and the number of Hispanics rose by almost 69 percent. This led to a slight decrease in the number of suburban students and a decrease in the fraction that is white.

We have described regional enrollment patterns that affect potential contact between white, Hispanic, and black students. Before examining integration levels, we look at another important factor: enrollment in private schools.

Tables 3 and 4 summarize private school enrollment data from the 1960, 1970, and 1980 U.S. Censuses. The trend may be surprising. The percentage of white students enrolled in private and parochial schools fell between 1960 and 1970 and fell again between 1970 and 1980. Table 4 distinguishes between central cities, suburban areas and nonmetropolitan areas. Private school enrollment is more common in urban areas than in suburbs and is the

TABLE 3

Percentage of U.S. Students Enrolled in Private and Parochial Schools by Race, 1960, 1970 and 1980

Student Group	1960	1970	1980
Whites	16.2	13.1	11.4
Blacks	3.1	3.5	5.4
Hispanics	9.9	9.3	9.5
All	14.3	11.5	10.3

Source: Public use files, 1960, 1970, and 1980 U.S. Censuses.

TABLE 4

Percentage of White Students Enrolled in Private and Parochial Schools by Region and Metropolitan Status, 1960, 1970, and 1980

	Percent Not in Public Schools		
Region	1960	1970	1980
Northeast	23.1	19.6	15.4
North Central	20.1	15.0	12.1
South	7.0	6.6	9.8
West	9.7	8.1	8.2
Central Cities			
Northeast	35.7	37.7	26.7
North Central	30.8	25.9	18.8
South	14.1	10.9	14.1
West	15.2	12.6	11.1
Metro Ring			
Northeast	20.0	16.5	14.2
North Central	20.0	14.7	12.8
South	9.9	8.5	10.4
West	9.3	7.5	8.5
Nonmetropolitan			
Northeast	12.5	8.7	6.5
North Central	11.8	8.2	6.3
South	2.7	3.4	5.9
West	5.1	4.5	3.2

Source: Public use files, 1960, 1970, and 1980 U.S. Censuses.

TABLE 5

Public School Enrollment by Proportion of Classmates Who Are White: U.S. Total, 1968 and 1980

Schools	Distribution of Enrollment (Percentage)					
Percent of Classmates	Blacks		Hispanics		Whites	
Who Are White	1968	1980	1968	1980	1968	1980
0-5	61.6	29.5	17.7	20.9	0.0	0.1
6-25	7.8	13.8	18.5	24.1	0.4	1.1
26-75	**16.7**	**43.8**	**39.9**	**41.8**	**7.5**	**19.3**
76-95	12.0	11.7	19.8	11.4	28.3	35.5
96-100	1.9	1.2	4.1	1.8	63.8	44.0
All Schools	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: 1968 and 1980 OCR Surveys.

least prevalent in nonmetropolitan areas. There is also interregional variation: whites living in the Northeast are the most likely to attend private schools and those living in the West are the least likely to do so. While the data reveal interregional differences, they fail to reveal an intertemporal pattern that is consistent with Table 1.

There is no evidence of growth in private and parochial school enrollment either nationally or regionally, except for in the South between 1970 and 1980. We have not examined individual districts, although data are available for 1970 and 1980. Thus, we cannot determine whether movement to private schools has played a major role in specific school districts.

The success of desegregation efforts depends in part on the availability of a multiracial population. The preceding discussion has revealed that school districts located in major metropolitan areas are likely to have extreme racial compositions. As minority students moved into the suburbs during the 1970s, however, the opportunity for interracial contact increased. We also find that, ***nationally***, white students are increasingly likely to attend public schools. The nationwide decrease in the fraction of public school students who are white reflects declining birthrates.

To this point, we have concentrated on residential enrollment patterns that affect the potential for school desegregation. We now ask the question, "Are schools desegregating?" Table 5 summarizes national integration levels

TABLE 6
Public School Enrollment by Proportion of Classmates Who Are Black: U.S. Total, 1968 and 1980

Schools Percent of Classmates Who Are Black	Distribution of Enrollment (Percentage)					
	Blacks		Hispanics		Whites	
	1968	1980	1968	1980	1968	1980
0-5	3.6	3.9	64.5	59.1	79.8	68.7
6-25	13.8	17.4	19.8	25.9	16.6	20.5
26-75	**17.6**	**44.0**	**14.1**	**13.6**	**3.4**	**10.4**
76-95	9.3	14.2	1.3	1.3	0.2	0.4
96-100	55.7	20.5	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.0
All Schools	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

in 1968 and 1980. To construct the table, schools were categorized by the fraction of students who are white. The table reports the proportion of students in each racial group—black, Hispanic, and white—who attended a school in each category. For example, the number in the upper left corner of Table 5 shows that, in 1968, 61.6 percent of black students (nationwide) were enrolled in schools where at most five percent of their classmates were white. These were essentially fully segregated schools. The next number shows that the fraction of black students attending such schools fell to 29.5 percent by 1980. The middle row refers to schools where between one-fourth and three-fourths of the students are white. Between 1968 and 1980, the fraction of black students enrolled in such schools increased from 16.7 to 43.8 percent.

It is clear from Table 5 that black/white interracial contact increased sharply between 1968 and 1980. What little change Hispanic students saw was toward less exposure to white classmates. The proportion of Hispanic students in schools where six to 25 percent of the students are white grew from 18.5 to 24.1 percent between 1968 and 1980. The fraction of Hispanic students in schools where 76 to 95 percent of all students are white fell from 19.8 to 11.4 percent during the same period.[12]

[12] We have not examined causes for the growing isolation of Hispanic students. Immigration into areas of Hispanic concentration has undoubtedly played a role.

Table 7
Public School Enrollment by Proportion of Classmates Who Are Hispanic: U.S. Total, 1968 and 1980

Schools	Distribution of Enrollment (Percentage)					
Percent of Classmates Who	Blacks		Hispanics		Whites	
Are Hispanic	1968	1980	1968	1980	1968	1980
0-5	88.1	78.3	10.5	7.9	89.0	84.4
6-25	7.7	14.3	26.0	20.6	8.7	11.5
26-75	**4.0**	**7.0**	**43.3**	**45.2**	**2.2**	**3.9**
76-95	0.2	0.4	13.8	18.8	0.1	0.2
96-100	0.0	0.0	6.4	7.5	0.0	0.0
All Schools	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Tables 6 and 7 are similar to Table 5.. In Table 6, schools are categorized by the fraction of students who are black and in Table 7 the categories refer to the fraction of Hispanics. Table 6 underscores the point made by Table 5. In 1968, 55.7 percent of black students attended schools where more than 95 percent of their classmates were black. This number dropped to 20.5 percent by 1980.

Table 7 shows that blacks were more likely to attend schools with higher proportions of Hispanics in 1980 than in 1968. This is partly due to the fact that, nationwide, the proportion of public school students reported as Hispanic almost doubled during that period.

Tables 8, 9, 10 and 11 report integration patterns by region. In all of these tables, schools are categorized by the fraction of students who are white. In the Northeast, blacks' exposure to whites changed very little and, in fact, the proportion attending segregated schools increased. The other regions–particularly the South–show pronounced changes. We can rank the regions by the fraction attending schools that are zero to five percent white (a measure of how segregated the school is) and by the fraction attending schools that are 26 to 75 percent white (a measure of integration). For black

TABLE 8

Public School Enrollment by Proportion of Classmates Who Are White: Northeast Region, 1968 and 1980

Schools	Distribution of Enrollment (Percentage)					
Percent of Classmates	Blacks		Hispanics		Whites	
Who Are White	1968	1980	1968	1980	1968	1980
0-5	35.9	45.3	32.7	37.7	0.1	0.1
6-25	16.8	13.3	24.9	23.9	0.5	0.8
26-75	**28.6**	**29.5**	**28.7**	**27.8**	**6.5**	**9.4**
76-95	15.3	9.3	9.9	7.9	19.7	25.2
96-100	3.4	2.6	3.8	2.7	73.2	64.5
All Schools	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

students, this yields a unique regional ranking in each year. In 1968, the Northeast region is the least segregated (for blacks and whites), followed by the West, the North Central region and the South. In 1980, the ranking changes: the Northeast becomes the most segregated region and the South becomes the least segregated.

There are no unique regional rankings for Hispanics. The Northeast region ranks as the least integrated in both years, and the South is less integrated than the West in both years. The North Central region has a smaller fraction of Hispanics in segregated schools, but also has a smaller fraction in the intermediate (26-75 percent white) category than either the South or the West.

TABLE 9

Public School Enrollment by Proportion of Classmates Who Are White: North Central Region, 1968 and 1980

Schools	Distribution of Enrollment (Percentage)					
Percent of Classmates	Blacks		Hispanics		Whites	
Who Are White	1968	1980	1968	1980	1968	1980
0-5	56.0	40.0	3.1	11.6	0.1	0.1
6-25	11.4	14.0	13.2	20.4	0.3	0.5
26-75	**19.6**	**32.6**	**30.5**	**32.2**	**3.5**	**7.9**
76-95	10.7	11.4	32.7	24.7	15.2	25.7
96-100	2.3	2.0	20.5	11.1	80.9	65.8
All Schools	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 10

Public School Enrollment by Proportion of Classmates Who Are White: South Region, 1968 and 1980

Schools	Distribution of Enrollment (Percentage)					
Percent of Classmates	Blacks		Hispanics		Whites	
Who Are White	1968	1980	1968	1980	1968	1980
0-5	73.6	20.9	26.5	25.2	0.1	0.2
6-25	2.7	13.7	22.4	26.1	0.4	1.5
26-75	**10.7**	**52.2**	**36.0**	**40.3**	**8.7**	**32.7**
76-95	11.7	12.6	12.8	7.8	39.9	41.7
96-100	1.3	0.6	2.3	0.6	50.9	23.9
All Schools	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 11

Public School Enrollment by Proportion of Classmates Who Are White: West Region, 1968 and 1980

Schools	Distribution of Enrollment (Percentage)					
Percent of Classmates	Blacks		Hispanics		Whites	
Who Are White	1968	1980	1968	1980	1968	1980
0-5	44.8	29.7	8.8	13.2	0.1	0.2
6-25	16.2	14.8	14.4	23.2	0.7	2.0
26-75	**27.3**	**43.5**	**48.4**	**49.6**	**15.0**	**26.2**
76-95	10.6	11.5	25.9	13.2	47.1	53.1
96-100	1.1	0.5	2.5	0.8	37.1	18.5
All Schools	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

3. Techniques Used for School Desegregation

Desegregation plans implemented during the last 25 years have employed techniques ranging from voluntary transfer programs to mandatory reassignment. The design of a plan is dictated by both the law and the specific needs of the district. One district-specific factor to consider in planning a desegregation strategy is the extent of segregation. Coping with isolated pockets of segregation is rarely a trivial task, but the plan is less likely to require multiple techniques than one directed at a dual (or otherwise highly segregated) school system. Techniques used for systemwide desegregation are equally appropriate for a plan that is smaller in scope, but the converse is not necessarily true.

Districts vary not only in the magnitude of the problem, but also in the cost of the solution. The racial composition of a district and the degree of residential segregation are important measures of the costs of desegregation. Clearly, it is easier to desegregate schools in racially mixed neighborhoods than schools that are isolated from students of a given race. The racial mix of students is important because it determines the magnitude and direction of the reassignment burden. For example, a fully segregated district with equal numbers of white and black students can be fully integrated only if half of the black students are reassigned to previously white schools while half of the white students are reassigned to previously black schools. On the other hand, a fully segregated district where three of every four students are black can be fully integrated by reassigning one-fourth of the black students and three-fourths of the white students. If the district consists of three whites for each black, then integration requires that three-fourths of the blacks and one-fourth of the whites be reassigned. In these last two examples, three-eighths of all students are reassigned, but the impact is greatest on the group with the smallest number of students. In the first example of racial balance, the reassignment burden is shared equally but the fraction of all students who are reassigned is greater. The general rule is that greater (districtwide) racial imbalance leads to smaller aggregate reassignments, but a proportionately larger number of the least populous group must be reassigned.

Additional constraints on a district's ability to desegregate might be imposed by its geographic scope and its metropolitan character. Whether a district is in a major urban center, a small city, a suburb, or a rural area implies much about its racial composition and degree of racial isolation. These environments also differ in their racial *stability*; as Section 2 shows, the demographic trends in central cities are distinct from those in suburban

areas. In addition to the impact of long term trends, the racial composition and geographic area can change with consolidation or annexation. These events occur infrequently, however.[13]

Unlike many rural and small town school systems, districts located in major urban areas are rarely the sole provider of public education to the community. This fact may influence the design of a desegregation plan. While districts that span an entire county are not "competing" with other school districts, they may cover a larger geographic area and face higher transportation costs when reassigning students. Other characteristics of the district affecting its ability to reassign students include the presence of natural barriers and the location and capacity of schools. The last factor is particularly relevant because school openings and closings frequently accompany the implementation of desegregation plans.

Another factor contributing to both the timing and nature of desegregation plans is the amount of community resistance. Court records contain many examples of prolonged litigation caused by school board and community opposition. This may delay the implementation of an entire plan, or it may simply postpone specific components of a plan. Even if the community is largely supportive of desegregation efforts, isolated groups may become disgruntled, particularly if they bear a disproportionate burden. Examples exist where resistance tempered the nature of the plan: magnets have been developed as alternatives for students who have been reassigned, decisions to close schools or alter attendance zones have been rescinded, and mandatory reassignment plans have granted exemptions to lower elementary school students (typically, grades K–2) and graduating high school seniors.[14]

Legal precedent also influences the nature of desegregation plans. The goals of desegregation efforts have changed over the years as one landmark decision after another has been handed down by the courts. A plan sanc-

[13]Since consolidation and annexation are sometimes ordered by the courts, they could be viewed as desegregation techniques rather than as factors affecting the character of the district. The latter characterization is chosen because they are rarely used and cannot achieve desegregation in the absence of other techniques.

[14]See Gordon Foster, "Desegregating Urban Schools: A Review of Techniques," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 43, February 1973, for a view of magnet schools as "escape routes". A report by the Lansing School District, *Report of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Educational Opportunity*, 1972, contains evidence that K–2 exemptions arose from a widespread desire to maintain neighborhood schools. The (unsuccessful) efforts of a group of parents to prevent their children from being reassigned are described in the unreported opinion *Stout v. Jefferson County Board of Education* (Alabama), 1971. In Nashville (see *Kelley v. Metropolitan County Board of Education of Nashville and Davidson County*, 511 F.Supp. 1363 (1981)), a court-ordered busing plan was modified to exclude lower grades.

tioned by the court may later be deemed unacceptable, leading to the implementation of a new plan. There are many examples of districts implementing multiple plans and using different techniques each time.

The Unicon/SDC sample of 125 districts documents almost 300 desegregation plans that were implemented between 1961 and 1985. The degree of heterogeneity within these districts is immediately apparent. They are located in every region of the country and range in size from Las Cruces, New Mexico, with barely over 15,000 students attending 23 schools in 1968, to New York City, with more than one million students in 853 schools. The sample includes districts in urban areas of all sizes, suburbs (*e.g.*, Arlington County, Virginia) and rural areas (*e.g.*, Jefferson Parish, Louisiana, and Raleigh County, West Virginia). It contains 34 countywide districts with central cities (the 11 Florida districts fit this description, plus Clark County, Nevada and others) and a small number of consolidated districts (New Castle County, Delaware and Jefferson County, Kentucky).

The districts also vary in their racial compositions and levels of segregation. Initial plans were implemented in Mobile, Alabama and Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, and in a number of other southern districts in the face of total racial segregation. At the other extreme, Santa Clara, California had a relatively even racial distribution prior to its 1979 desegregation plan.[15] When the 1965 plan was designed for Harford County, Maryland, the district was 92 percent white. Compton, California, on the other hand, became over 99 percent black in the 1980s, while Buffalo, New York had a virtual 50–50 split between white and minority students prior to its 1977 plan.

It is not surprising to find a large number of different desegregation strategies in a sample with this much variation. Despite the diversity, the techniques almost always fit into one of six categories. The rest of this section describes the standard techniques and provides examples. The evolution of court-sanctioned techniques is then outlined to clarify the relationship between plan design and legal precedent.

3.1 Six Standard Techniques: Definitions and Examples

The components of a desegregation plan can be classified as voluntary or involuntary. This distinction refers to whether students are permitted to choose the school they will attend; it is unrelated to the issue of whether the plan itself was court-ordered or voluntarily entered into by the school

[15]The dissimilarity index measured 0.20 in 1978. See Section 5 for an explanation of this index.

district. We identify three voluntary desegregation techniques: freedom of choice, magnet programs, and transfer programs. Involuntary techniques include neighborhood attendance zones, rezoning, and pairing and clustering. Definitions and examples of each of these techniques follow.

- *Freedom of choice* (also called open enrollment) allows students to transfer to the school of their choice. Students cannot be denied their choice unless the school's capacity has been exceeded; proximity to the school is the standard criterion used to assign students in such cases.[16] It is *not* necessary, however, that the transfer improve the level of integration. While transfers are typically available to every student, exceptions exist. In Houston's 1967 plan, for example, transfers were restricted to students in grades 9 through 12.[17] Freedom of choice plans may also be mandatory—that is, students are required to select a school. The 1967 plans in Polk County, Florida and in Orange County, Florida had this feature.[18]

- *Magnets* include a broad array of educational programs that are either the focus of an entire school (dedicated magnets) or offered as part of a standard curriculum (mini-magnets or part-schools). At the elementary level, magnets typically offer a special learning environment, such as "open education," accelerated learning, or an emphasis on fundamental skills. Secondary school magnets may offer a particular curriculum, such as vocational skills, math and science, languages, or performing arts.

  Closely related to magnets are part-time magnets, where students participate in programs for part of the day, and special programs that are not associated with a particular school. In San Diego, for example, fifth grade students participate in a week of cultural activities at a city park and sixth grade students have the opportunity to spend a week at camp.[19]

---

[16]The mechanics of freedom of choice plans are described in the corrected decree, *Davis v. East Baton Rouge School Board* (Louisiana), 1967.

[17]See "Chronology of Events Relating to Civil Action 10444," p. 2, released by the Houston Independent School District.

[18]This is documented in Cynthia McGrath, "Race and Education in Orange County, Florida: The Process of Desegregation," Florida Technological University (unpublished), and *United States v. Board of Public Instruction of Polk County, Florida*, 395 F.2d 66 (5th Cir. 1968).

[19]The district's extensive magnet program is described in reports prepared by the Board of Education, San Diego Unified School District; *e.g.*, "San Diego Plan for Racial Integra-

A magnet is called "citywide" if enrollment is offered to every eligible student in the district (on a space available basis and, typically, with racial guidelines). "Neighborhood preference" magnets give enrollment priority to a particular racial group. When an existing school is converted to a dedicated magnet, its former students may be given enrollment priority (Pittsburgh's 1980 plan included this provision). In Rapides Parish, Louisiana, students attending a particular high school were required to remain in attendance even after its conversion to a magnet; voluntary assignment was then phased in during the three years required for the last of these students to graduate.[20] In Milwaukee and Seattle, schools were grouped into "zones" or "leagues;" priority for attending magnet schools was given to students within the school's zone.[21]

- *Other voluntary transfers* include the commonly used majority-to-minority (m-to-m) transfers. These programs permit any student to transfer from a school where he or she is in the majority to a school where he or she is in the minority. Some m-to-m plans permit the student to transfer to a school where he or she is *less* in the majority, as long as the transfer improves the level of integration in the district. In a district that is 80 percent white, for example, a white student may be permitted to transfer from a school that is 90 percent white to one that is 70 percent white. A variation of this technique involves specifying the schools to which students may transfer. In Richmond, California, clusters were formed (ranging in size from 4 to 13 schools) and students were granted m-to-m transfers within their clusters;[22] a similar strategy was used in Buffalo.

  A closely related desegregation technique is one-way transfers. These programs permit minority students attending predominantly minority schools to transfer to designated receiver schools. The one-way transfers may take place within the district (*e.g.*, in Richmond and Buffalo), or students may attend schools in a suburban district; Rochester,

---

tion, 1979–1982 (Revised)."

[20]This is described in the unreported consent order, *Valley v. Rapides Parish School Board* (Louisiana), 1975.

[21]See "Comprehensive Plan for Increasing Educational Opportunities and Improving Racial Balance in the Milwaukee Public Schools," prepared by the Office of Superintendent of Schools, Milwaukee Public Schools, 1976.

[22]See "The Richmond Integration Plan," a report prepared by the Richmond Unified School District.

Hartford, and St. Louis all had such plans.[23] Houston implemented an interdistrict transfer program between its schools and a number of suburban districts. Not only was the program two-way, but it granted transfers to students of all races.[24]

- *Neighborhood attendance zones* is a mandatory technique that assigns students to schools in their neighborhoods. This strategy was primarily used to end the dual system practice of sending students to distant schools because closer schools were not designated for their race. Whether this technique improves the level of integration depends, of course, on the racial composition of the neighborhood. Some districts—Little Rock, Denver, and Norfolk, Virginia, for example—*reverted* to neighborhood attendance zones (for those schools in racially balanced areas) after having used other mandatory techniques.[25]

- *Rezoning* refers to any change in attendance zones except when pairing and clustering are involved. It may be necessitated by the closing of a school or by the formation of a magnet since, in both situations, the school's former students must be assigned elsewhere. Similarly, the opening of a school requires that portions of other schools' attendance zones be shifted to the new school. In the absence of these events or in conjunction with them, a district may simply reassign students to improve integration. Rezoning plans vary tremendously in their scope: they may affect as few as two schools, or they may alter the attendance zone of every school in the district.

  Rezoning can be done in a variety of ways. Contiguous rezoning alters the attendance boundaries between adjacent schools. Noncontiguous rezoning reassigns students to a school that does not share a

[23]These plans are described in "Urban-Suburban Transfer Program, Final Evaluation Report 1972–73" by the City School District of Rochester, New York, Carolyn Ralston and Ann Lewis, "Special Field Reports on School Desegregation Projects: Hartford, Forrest City, Bernalillo, Dade County," The National Center for Research and Information on Equal Educational Opportunity, Teachers College, Columbia University, May, 1971, and in *Liddell v. Board of Education of the City of St. Louis*, 508 F.Supp. 101 (E.D. Miss. 1980).

[24]See "Voluntary Interdistrict Education Plan," prepared by the Houston Independent School District, 1980.

[25]See *Clark v. Board of Education of the Little Rock School District*, 705 F.2d 265 (8th Cir., 1982); *Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado*, 504 F.Supp. 399 (Denver 1982); *Riddick (Beckett) v. School Board of the City of Norfolk*, 784 F.2d 521 (4th Cir. 1986).

boundary with their current school. Schools with an inadequate racial balance are often designated as "satellite receivers" and are assigned students from other parts of the district. Noncontiguous rezoning entails greater transportation costs than does contiguous zoning, and invariably involves busing. Mecklenburg County, North Carolina was the first district to implement such a rezoning scheme and many others followed after the landmark *Swann* decision was handed down.[26] Some districts assign students to secondary schools on the basis of the school they attended for lower grades. Thus, junior and senior high schools are often rezoned by altering the feeder patterns rather than by changing geographic attendance zones. Dallas presents an example of this technique; the district also desegregated its upper elementary (grades 4–6) schools by altering the feeder patterns from the grade K–3 schools.[27]

In designating students for reassignment, districts may use criteria other than geographic locale or feeder patterns. In Wichita, Kansas, students at three predominantly black schools were reassigned to schools throughout the district, and white students were sent to the three schools. Volunteers for reassignment were first solicited, and then a lottery was used. Siblings of students selected by the lottery were given the option of transferring to the same school.[28] Some districts—Boston and Detroit, for example—were divided into "sub-districts," and rezoning was done within these smaller units.

- *Pairing and clustering* involves reassigning students between a pair or a group of schools, usually via grade restructuring. The schools grouped together may have either contiguous or noncontiguous attendance zones. For example, a (predominantly) white school and a (predominantly) black school, both offering grades K–6, could be paired by converting one into a lower elementary school (grades 1–3) and the other into an upper elementary school (grades 4–6); kindergarten students would be unaffected by the plan. This is a common grade

[26] *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* (North Carolina), 402 U.S. 1 (1971).

[27] This is described in the unreported order *Tasby v. Wright* (Dallas Independent School District), 1982.

[28] The plan is detailed in *Linker v. Unified School District #259, Wichita, Kansas* 344 F.Supp. 1187 (1972).

restructuring scheme that was used in Little Rock[29] and elsewhere. In an earlier plan, Little Rock reorganized grades as K–5, 6–7, 8–9 and 10–12. Another Little Rock plan paired fourth and fifth grade students in schools on opposite sides of the city; this resulted in some schools offering grades K–4 and 6, and others offering grades K–3 and 5–6.[30] Pairing and clustering plans frequently produce single grade centers. In Fresno, California, for example, three freshman schools (grade 9) were formed. Los Angeles established a number of three-school clusters, with each school in the cluster offering grade 4, 5, or 6; other schools were paired, with one school becoming a fourth grade center and the other specializing in fifth grade.[31]

Most pairing and clustering plans rely on grade restructuring, but students can be exchanged on the basis of other criteria. In Jefferson County, Kentucky, all first grade students attended their neighborhood schools for the fall quarter, and then entire classes were exchanged during the winter and spring quarters. Students in grades 2–12 were randomly grouped by race and grade. Each group was then told for how many years it would be reassigned (one or two for white groups and eight or nine for minorities), and the grades in which reassignment would occur. Since clusters consisted of one minority school and several white schools, minority students were also told which school they would attend.[32]

3.2 Landmark Court Cases: the Evolution of Desegregation Techniques

School districts have many options to choose from in designing a plan that meets their specific needs. However, the plan must also be acceptable to the court. The ensuing discussion of landmark court cases indicates how the court's definition of "acceptable" has evolved. It is not intended to be a

[29]See *Clark v. Board of Education of the Little Rock School District*, 705 F.2d 265 (8th Cir., 1982).

[30]The 5-2-2-3 scheme is detailed in *Clark v. Board of Education of the Little Rock School District*, 328 F.Supp. 1205 (1971). The second pairing scheme is reported in *Clark v. Board of Education of the Little Rock School District*, 465 F.2d 1044 (1972).

[31]See "School Desegregation in Fresno, California," prepared by the Fresno Unified School District, 1978 and the unreported opinion *Crawford v. Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles*, 1978.

[32]See *Newburg Area Council, Inc. v. Board of Education of Jefferson County*, 521 F.2d 578 (6th Cir. 1975).

comprehensive history of school desegregation, but merely a demonstration that legal precedent is a constraint imposed upon the design of a desegregation plan.

Desegregation efforts began with the Topeka, Kansas case *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954) which outlawed *de jure* segregation. For the most part, early plans appeared in the South and consisted of freedom of choice; this satisfied the imperative to dismantle the dual school systems.

Green v. Board of Education of New Kent County, Virginia, 391 U.S. 430 (1968) ended the use of freedom of choice. This decision noted that such plans had virtually no impact on the level of segregation, and decreed that alternative methods be used. For a short period, the choice of technique required to achieve desegregation was debated. *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg (North Carolina) Board of Education*, 402 U.S. 1 (1971) dramatically altered the nature of desegregation plans. This decision stated that racially identifiable schools must cease to exist, and it sanctioned the use of districtwide busing. In the early 1970s, districts throughout the South implemented large-scale, involuntary plans.

The first major decision outside the South was *Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado*, 413 U.S. 189 (1973) which stated that official action leading to *de facto* segregation must be viewed in the same manner as *de jure* segregation. This decision was also noteworthy because it extended the remedy to Hispanics.

In *Milliken v. Bradley*, 418 U.S. 717 (1974) the Detroit school system was denied an interdistrict remedy, but the court detailed the conditions under which such a plan would be acceptable. The inclusion of a suburban district in a metropolitan remedy required proof that it had engaged in segregative practices and that those actions had an interdistrict effect. *Newburg Area Council, Inc. v. Board of Education of Jefferson County*, 521 F.2d 578 (6th Cir. 1975) decreed that the stringent conditions set out in *Milliken v. Bradley* were met, and ordered the first interdistrict remedy for the Louisville and Jefferson County, Kentucky school districts.

A decision concerning the Boston schools, *Morgan v. Kerrigan*, 401 F.Supp. 216 (D.Mass. 1975) sanctioned magnets as a component of a desegregation plan. The court later decided that a magnet plan could substitute for involuntary techniques and the first all-magnet plan was implemented in Milwaukee (see D. Bennett, "The Impact of Court-Ordered Desegregation: A Defendant's View," 1979).

4. Sources and Characteristics of the Data

4.1 The Unicon/SDC Sample

In 1968, there were 21,782 public school districts in the United States, although the majority were quite small. All but 374 districts had under 15,000 students and only 79 had more than 50,000 students. A sample of 125 districts was chosen to permit detailed analysis of the methods and effects of desegregation. The following criteria were used in selecting the sample:

- Every district with 50,000 or more students in 1968 and 20 to 90 percent minority representation was chosen.
- Districts with 15,000 or more students in 1968 and ten to 90 percent minority representation were chosen with sampling probabilities proportional to their size and regional representation.
- The remaining districts—those with fewer than 15,000 students, less than ten percent minority representation, or greater than 90 percent minority representation—were excluded from the sample.

These criteria yield a sample with 68 large districts (50,000 or more students) and 57 districts with 15,000 to 49,999 students. Of the 68 large districts, 56 were chosen because they met the first criterion. The 12 others have minority representation between ten and 90 percent and were randomly selected under the second criterion. Since there were only 79 districts with at least 50,000 students in 1968, this implies that all but 11 were included in the sample. Eight were omitted because their minority representation was below ten percent. They are Baltimore County (Maryland), Fairfax County (Virginia), Montgomery County (Maryland), Dekalb County (Georgia), Granite (Salt Lake City, Utah), Jefferson County (Colorado), Kanawha County (West Virginia), and San Juan Unified (Sacramento, California). One district—Washington, D.C., the eleventh largest in the country—was omitted because it was greater than 90 percent minority. This leaves two districts that were eligible for the sample under the second criterion, but were not chosen in the random draw. They are Anne Arundel (Annapolis, Maryland) and Garden Grove (California).

Subsequent to 1968, four districts in the sample underwent consolidations.[33] The Louisville, Kentucky and Jefferson County School Districts

[33] Although the Indianapolis city and suburban districts remained autonomous, it is included in this group because the interdistrict transfers were integral to desegregation efforts.

combined in 1975, and 11 districts in New Castle County, Delaware (including Wilmington) were consolidated in 1976. In 1981, the Indianapolis school district implemented an interdistrict plan involving a number of suburban districts. In 1985, the Fayetteville, North Carolina and Cumberland County districts combined. The sample includes all of these districts, but districts that ultimately consolidate are treated as a composite.

The sample includes the ten largest districts in the country: New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, Houston, Dade County (Miami), Baltimore, Dallas, and Cleveland. Although the 125 districts amount to less than one percent of all school districts, the sample accounts for approximately 20 percent of national public school enrollment in 1968. Since the larger districts have disproportionately large shares of minority students, the sample includes about 45 percent of all minority students attending public schools in 1968.

The exclusion of small districts and those with extreme racial compositions is justified, since any desegregation efforts they might undertake are viewed with less interest. Districts that are predominantly white or minority will not be able to avoid single race schools unless they merge with other districts. While extremely small districts may include multiple racial groups, their size limits the extent of desegregation efforts. If a district has only one school at each level, then it is perfectly integrated since the composition of each school corresponds to the composition of the district. About 25 percent of all students attend school districts that might meet this description—*i.e.*, they have less than 3,000 students and an average of less than five schools. Slightly more than one-third of all students attend districts with between 3,000 and 15,000 students and an average of 11 schools. While desegregation may not be moot in these districts, it is likely to involve simplistic measures.

For purposes of summarizing and analyzing the sample, we characterize the districts along two dimensions: region and metropolitan status. Four regional categories are used, following Census classifications (although, in analyzing districts, we aggregate the nonsouthern regions into one group). The sample has 58 districts in the South, 29 in the West, 25 in the North Central region, and 13 in the North. The six metropolitan categories are large urban (with 27 districts), medium urban (26 districts), small urban (29 districts), suburban (five districts),[34] countywide (35 districts), and rural (four districts). Districts located in urban areas are grouped according to their city's 1972 population. Large urban districts are located in cities with

[34]The Indianapolis suburbs are placed in this category, while the city district is categorized as large urban. Thus, these numbers add to 126.

400,000 or more residents. Medium urban is defined as 165,000 to 400,000 residents, and small urban is defined as under 165,000 residents.[35] Countywide refers to those districts that are the sole source of public education within the county. Rural districts are a subset of this group, but are located in counties that do not have central cities.

4.2 Enrollment Data

The project's main objective was to compile enrollment data (by ethnicity) from 1967 to 1985 for every school in every district in the sample. We have succeeded in compiling an extraordinarily complete record. When omissions occur, it is usually because the enrollment records for all of the schools in a given district and a given year could not be located; rarely were partial records found for a given year. The data are reported for up to five ethnic groups (white, black, Hispanic, Asian, and Native American). School names and grade levels are also included.

Most of the data are from three sources: the Office of Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of Education, Tauber-Wilson tapes, and individual school districts.[36] OCR data are machine readable and are available for 1968 through 1974 and even-numbered years between 1976 and 1982.[37] The Tauber-Wilson data are cleaned versions of the OCR data and are available for 1968 through 1974 and 1976. All available Tauber-Wilson data were used. Data were gathered directly from the school districts to fill in the odd-numbered years and extend the time period past 1982. SDC collected data for two to three years per district, and Unicon collected the remaining years. Of the over 200,000 school-by-year observations in the data, approximately 57 percent are taken from Tauber-Wilson tapes, five percent are from OCR tapes, and 38 percent come from the districts (seven percent via SDC and 31 percent via Unicon).

If the data were complete, there would be records for 19 years (1967 to 1985) for each of the 125 school districts, for a total of 2,375 years of data (where each year of data reports enrollment by race for every school in that district). In fact, there are 2,073 years of data (or close to 90 percent

[35] This is similar to the classification scheme used in Reynolds Farley, Toni Richards, and Clarence Wurdock, "School Desegregation and White Flight: An Investigation of Competing Models and Their Discrepant Findings," *Sociology of Education*, Vol. 53 (July, 1980): 123–139.

[36] In a few cases the enrollment data were collected from state boards of education rather than from the individual districts.

[37] The 1984 OCR tape was released after data for the project were compiled.

of the targeted number). For 88 districts, 1967 data are missing and 1985 data are missing for 44 districts. However, data are available prior to 1967 for ten districts (24 years) and district totals are available for an additional 12 years. Appendix B indicates the years available for each district in the sample.

The full data are being released in machine readable format, so interested parties can examine what they wish. Table A2 (see Appendix A), provides endpoint summaries for all 125 districts, listed alphabetically by state. The summaries include the first and last year for which enrollment data are available alongside total enrollment, the percentage of enrollment that is minority and the dissimilarity index for both years.[38]

4.3 Desegregation Plan Data

Information on the desegregation plans implemented by each district in the sample was obtained from the following sources:[39]

- **Published Court Documents:** Since many desegregation plans were ordered by a federal court, the issues and resolutions may be chronicled in the *Federal Reporter*. The documents vary in their level of detail. Some list the schools involved in pairing and clustering or rezoning, describe new attendance zones, list the schools that open, close, or convert to magnets, etc. Others describe the strategy to be used, but do not indicate the scope of the plan. Many documents provide only scant detail.

- **Unpublished Court Documents:** For many districts, extremely detailed plan information is available in an unpublished consent decree.

- **School District Documents:** Districts often prepare reports describing their plans. Such reports may be required by the courts or a government agency, or they may be for internal use. Brochures designed to inform patrons about new educational opportunities (especially magnet programs) often provide useful information. In addition to formal reports, minutes from school board meetings, correspondence, and other documents were examined.

[38] This index is defined and discussed in subsequent sections.

[39] Appendix C lists most of the documents that were examined.

- **Government Agency Documents:** These include reports solicited by the United States Commission on Civil Rights and information gathered by the Department of Education.

- **Other Published Documents:** These include newspaper clippings, journal articles, and books written by education researchers.

- **Surveys:** SDC conducted a survey to learn about the desegregation plans. Each district in the sample was either visited by an SDC employee or mailed a survey.[40] The districts were asked which techniques were used for each plan, and how many schools and students were involved. Additional questions focused on phasing, busing, attempts to upgrade school quality, efforts to disseminate information to the community, and magnet programs.

Table A3 in Appendix A provides information on each desegregation plan in the sample. The year or years of implementation and the techniques used are listed for 283 plans in 108 districts. The remaining 17 districts apparently did not implement plans, although they may have magnet programs. Multiple implementation years appear when a plan was phased in or when implementation was partially delayed. We assign most magnet plans a three-year implementation period (if the relevant data are available), beginning with the year the magnets began operation. We adopt this convention because magnet programs typically have a gradual impact on integration levels.

[40]Site surveys were administered to 37 districts and mail surveys were completed by 46 districts. The remaining 42 districts either failed to respond or never implemented a desegregation plan.

5. Enrollment and Integration Levels: Overview

5.1 Measuring Levels of Integration

There are a variety of ways to describe integration levels. In our analysis of national aggregates in Section 2, we characterized a school according to the fraction of students who are white, black, Hispanic, Asian, and Native American. We then counted the number of students in each racial group attending schools of a given racial mix. This permits us to measure, for example, the percentage of black students nationwide who, in a given year, attended schools where at least one-third of their classmates were white. This kind of description provides a detailed view of interracial exposure, but it is not easily summarized. Therefore, we use a single summary index of integration levels in our analysis of the 125 school districts. In doing so, we combine all minorities into a single group and contrast their enrollment distribution between the schools in a district with the distribution of white students.

The measure we use is the dissimilarity index, which is inversely related to the level of integration. The index is the ratio of two numbers. The numerator is the number of students who must be reassigned for each school to have the districtwide average minority representation. The denominator is the number of students who would be reassigned to move from complete segregation to districtwide average minority representation in every school.[41] The dissimilarity index takes as given the proportion of students in a district who are white; it can be viewed as the fraction of the segregation gap that remains.

Suppose that ten percent of a district's students are minority and that the current distribution is such that nine percent must be reassigned in order for every school to be ten percent minority. If this district were completely segregated, it would be necessary to reassign 18 percent of the students to achieve perfect integration (where each school is ten percent minority). The dissimilarity index in this case is 0.50 (0.09 divided by 0.18).

To understand how the denominator is calculated note that, in the example, it would be necessary to replace ten percent of the students attending all-white schools with minority students and to replace 90 percent of the students at minority schools with whites. This involves transferring ten percent

[41] Formally, the dissimilarity index is defined as $\Sigma t_s|p_s - p|/2Tp(1-p)$ where the subscript s indicates a school, t_s is total enrollment in school s, p_s is the fraction of students in the school who are in one of the minority groups, p is the district's average for p_s and T is the number of students in the district.

of the white students (who comprise 90 percent of the total) and 90 percent of the minorities (who comprise ten percent of the total), or 18 percent of all students ($0.10 \times 0.90 + 0.90 \times 0.10$). Letting p be the fraction of students who are minority ($p = 0.10$ in the example), the general formula is that the proportion of all students to be reassigned is $2p(1-p)$. The fraction of minority students reassigned is $(1-p)$ and the fraction of white students reassigned is p.

The dissimilarity index is often criticized because it is not sensitive to the districtwide percentage of minority students. For example, a district with 90 percent minority students has an index of 0.50 if reassigning nine percent of its students would result in every school being 90 percent minority. The denominator in this case is 0.18 (as in the previous example), since ten percent of the minority students and 90 percent of the whites would have to be reassigned to move from complete segregation to complete integration. The dissimilarity index is the same as in the previous example where only ten percent of the students are minority. Moreover, the index would also be 0.50 if half the students were minority and if reassigning 25 percent of the students would achieve racial homogeneity.[42]

We examined alternative indices of integration[43] and found that they usually provide similar information in describing changes within a district over time. That is, if one index shows that a desegregation program resulted in massive integration, the others agree.[44] The fact that the dissimilarity index is useful in describing changes within a district does not imply that it is useful in comparing districts. The previous examples of three districts with identical indices and very different racial mixes illustrate this point.

For purposes of comparing districts and evaluating alternative desegregation strategies, several kinds of information are important. It is useful

[42] When evaluating desegregation plans, there is generally concern with the busing burden imposed on each racial group. The above examples show that, when starting with dual school systems, an equal busing burden does not imply that the fraction of white students bused will equal the fraction of minorities bused. Instead, it implies that the *number* of whites and minorities bused will be the same. This requires that the proportion of the numerical majority that is bused is below the corresponding proportion for the numerical minority.

[43] These include the exposure, gini, Coleman, variance ratio, entropy, and Atkinson indices.

[44] When a school district's racial mix changes rapidly over time, however, indices that adjust for racial mix (*i.e.*, normalized indices) often show different patterns than do unnormalized indices. The exposure index is the only unnormalized index we examine. Section 6 gives examples where trends in the exposure index differ from trends in the dissimilarity index.

to know what proportion of all students would have to be reassigned to achieve racial uniformity among schools. The dissimilarity index, together with knowledge of the fraction of students who are minority, gives that number. It is also useful to know how the reassignment burden would be shared between the minority and majority groups. Unless the dissimilarity index equals one (*i.e.*, the district is fully segregated), it cannot answer this question. The districtwide minority representation tells us what the racial composition of each school would be if the district were fully integrated. But the dissimilarity index cannot be used to infer information about minority representation under existing assignment patterns. Thus, changes in racial composition that coincide with movement to full integration cannot be inferred from the dissimilarity index.

5.2 Trends in the Data

The enrollment data for the 125 districts in our sample show that, in general, total enrollments have fallen sharply, minorities have increased as a percentage of all students and schools are much more integrated in 1984 and 1985 than in 1967 and 1968. The largest decline in total enrollment was in San Lorenzo, California, where it fell at an average annual rate of 4.9 percent.[45] The leaders in this category tend to be older, nonsouthern cities: St. Louis, Indianapolis, Seattle, Dayton, and Cleveland follow San Lorenzo. Enrollment increased for only 19 districts, with Mesa, Arizona showing the largest gain (5.5 percent per year, on average). With the exceptions of Modesto, California and Harford County, Maryland, all districts showing growth are located in the Sunbelt.

Minority enrollment declined in 30 districts. Jefferson County, Alabama had the largest decline (an average annual rate of 5.1 percent per year), followed by St. Louis, Cleveland, Indianapolis, Compton, California, Pittsylvania County, Virginia, and Pittsburgh. The next largest decline was in Raleigh County, West Virginia, which is the only district in the sample where white enrollment increased and minority enrollment decreased. The largest increases in minority enrollment occurred in Long Beach, California (7.6 percent per year, on average), followed by Prince George's County, Maryland, Modesto, California, and Mesa, Arizona.

[45] In discussing enrollment changes over the entire period studied, we report average annual geometric growth rates. Letting W68 and W85 represent the natural logarithms of white enrollment in 1968 and 1985, the growth rate over this 17 year period is calculated as $100(e^{(W85-W68)}/17 - 1)$.

TABLE 12
Districts Where Dissimilarity Index Increased
Showed the Smallest Decline

District	Dissimilarity Index First	Last	Change
Districts Where Dissimilarity Index *Increased*			
Raleigh County, West Virginia	0.46	0.57	0.11
Newark, New Jersey	0.75	0.80	0.05
Yonkers, New York	0.51	0.55	0.04
Oakland, California	0.60	0.63	0.03
East Saint Louis, Illinois	0.77	0.80	0.03
Norwalk, California	0.30	0.32	0.02
Santa Clara, California	0.18	0.19	0.01
New York, New York	0.66	0.67	0.01
Districts With the *Smallest Reduction* in Dissimilarity Index			
Modesto, California	0.37	0.34	-.03
Richmond, California	0.45	0.42	-.03
Mesa, Arizona	0.27	0.22	-.05
Hartford, Connecticut	0.64	0.59	-.05
Saginaw, Michigan	0.76	0.70	-.06

The level of segregation increased in eight districts during the period under study. They are listed in Table 12, along with the five districts showing the smallest decline. A distinguishing feature of the districts in Table 12 is that, for most, we have no record that a desegregation plan was adopted during the period when enrollments are observed. The exceptions are Santa Clara, California where rezoning plans were implemented in 1979, 1981, and 1984 and Raleigh County, West Virginia where rezoning was used in 1973. For four others (Newark, Oakland, Hartford, Connecticut and Richmond, California), implementation either preceded or coincided with the start of the enrollment data so changes associated with plan implementation cannot be observed. Seven of the districts listed in Table 12 apparently have not implemented desegregation plans. (They are among only 17 districts in the sample without plans.)

Table 13 lists the ten districts (in rank order) showing the largest decline in the dissimilarity index. All ten adopted one or more major desegregation

TABLE 13

Districts Showing the Greatest Reduction in the Dissimilarity Index

District	Dissimilarity Index		
	First	Last	Change
Mecklenburg County (Charlotte), North Carolina	1.00	0.19	-0.81
Greenville County, South Carolina	1.00	0.24	-0.76
Rapides Parish (Alexandria), Louisiana	0.96	0.26	-0.70
Dayton, Ohio	0.86	0.19	-0.67
Cleveland, Ohio	0.87	0.20	-0.67
Norfolk, Virginia	0.83	0.17	-0.67
Pittsylvania County, Virginia	0.88	0.22	-0.66
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	0.89	0.23	-0.66
New Castle County (Wilmington), Delaware	0.80	0.15	-0.65
Dougherty County (Albany), Georgia	0.94	0.30	-0.64

plans. The major plan implemented by nine districts involved rezoning and all but one (Pittsylvania County, Virginia) also used pairing and clustering.[46]

The ten districts shown in Table 13 have another factor in common: they were all highly segregated in the first year. In addition, eight (all but Dayton and Cleveland) are in the South and seven of the eight are also countywide (only one countywide district in the sample—Clark County, Nevada—is not in the South). None of the countywide districts experienced as sharp an enrollment decline as did the three central city districts. This is true for total enrollment and also for white enrollment. Norfolk, Virginia experienced a 63 percent fall in white enrollment,[47] while New Castle County, Delaware and Dougherty County, Georgia experienced roughly 50 percent reductions in white enrollment. The four other countywide districts (including Pittsylvania County, Virginia, which is rural) lost no more than 25 percent of their white students. In comparison, the three urban districts (Cleveland, Dayton, and Oklahoma City) lost more than 70 percent of their white students.

Based on Table 13, one might conclude that countywide districts have greater integrative potential because the broader geographic base makes white flight more difficult. Another conjecture is that the largest integrative

[46]The tenth district is New Castle County, Delaware, where urban-suburban transfers were used.

[47]These numbers refer to changes made over an 18-year period (1967 to 1985). When a district's observation interval is shorter than 18 years, the data are extrapolated (assuming constant geometric growth), so a standard interval is used to compare districts.

changes were experienced by districts that were initially highly segregated. The phenomenon discussed earlier of dramatic reductions in white enrollment in large central city districts, with smaller losses in suburban districts, is also supported by Table 13. However, it would be wrong to conclude that any of these factors—or the type of desegregation plans used—caused the large drops in the dissimilarity index. Explanations of differential enrollment losses among districts require much finer analysis than our simple summaries provide. The data compiled by this project will be useful for subsequent studies of this issue.

Table 14 lists the ten districts in the sample with the lowest dissimilarity indices (based on the most recent enrollment data) and Table 15 lists the ten districts with the highest indices. For purposes of comparison, percentages of students who are minority are listed, along with the 1967 to 1985 loss in white enrollment. The most segregated districts are central cities where total enrollment is much greater than in the least segregated districts. As a general rule, minority percentages are also much higher in these districts and white enrollments have dropped more sharply. As Table 15 shows, minority representation in the highly segregated districts ranges from two-thirds of total enrollment (Saginaw) to 98 percent (East Saint Louis) and white enrollment losses range from 57 percent (New Orleans) to 94 percent (East Saint Louis). Among the least segregated districts, New Hanover County, North Carolina stands at one extreme, with only a two percent loss of white students and minority representation of 30 percent (1985 enrollment was 19,318 students). At the other extreme, 77 percent of the students in Pasadena, California are minority and white enrollment in the Pasadena schools dropped 72 percent between 1967 and 1985.

TABLE 14
Districts With the Lowest Dissimilarity Index
(Most Recent Available Year)

District	Dissimilarity Index	Percent Minority	Percent Loss in White Enrollment
Stamford, Connecticut	0.08	46.3	62
San Lorenzo, California	0.13	35.9	70
New Hanover County, North Carolina	0.14	30.3	2
Columbus, Ohio	0.14	45.5	59
Lawton, Oklahoma	0.14	35.0	24
New Castle County, Delaware	0.15	32.5	48
Pasadena, California	0.16	76.6	72
Buffalo, New York	0.16	55.5	58
Hayward, California	0.16	46.6	63
Lansing, Michigan	0.17	39.4	26

Projection when enrollment data do not coincide with 1967–1985 start and end dates.

TABLE 15
Districts With the Highest Dissimilarity Index
(Most Recent Available Year)

District	Dissimilarity Index	Percent Minority	Percent Loss in White Enrollment
Newark, New Jersey	0.80	91.1	69
East Saint Louis, Illinois	0.80	97.8	94
Atlanta, Georgia	0.76	93.0	90
Birmingham, Alabama	0.74	81.4	77
New Orleans Parish, Louisiana	0.71	86.2	57
Saginaw, Michigan	0.70	66.8	62
Chicago, Illinois	0.69	85.8	74
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	0.68	74.5	59
Memphis, Tennessee	0.68	76.9	69
New York, New York	0.67	73.7	62

Projection when enrollment data do not coincide with 1967–1985 start and end dates. Beginning and ending dates for enrollments are listed for individual districts in Appendix Table A2.

6. Changes in White Enrollment and the Segregation Index Surrounding Implementation of Major Plans

Desegregation programs are intended to increase interracial contact among students. By causing white and minority students to attend the same schools, they should also expose them to the same quality instruction. Do they? Are all plan types equally successful? How does the enrollment of white students respond to desegregation efforts? Are enrollment responses the same for all types of plans?

Questions related to integration of classrooms within schools cannot be addressed with the data we have compiled, nor can questions related to instructional quality or educational achievement. The data describe total enrollment and the racial composition of enrollment in each school, supplemented with information on plan implementation dates and the primary features of plans. In many cases, the schools that were involved in a program can be identified and subsequent enrollment changes can be traced but we have not tried to link plans to individual schools. The questions our data can address refer to changes in districtwide levels of integration across schools and to changes in enrollment. This section summarizes broad patterns of change surrounding the implementation of different plan types.

6.1 Major Plan Classification

Seventeen districts in the sample apparently did not adopt a school desegregation plan. The remaining 108 districts implemented at least one plan during the period under study.[1] When multiple plans are observed, all but one or two are invariably first attempts, modifications, or follow-ups, and can be considered of secondary importance. We consider only the most important plan or plans adopted by each district. They are called major plans, although their magnitude varies among districts. Some had an enormous impact on segregation levels: the rezoning plan implemented in Muscogee County, Georgia lowered the dissimilarity index by 74.9, which was the largest one-year change seen. At the other extreme, the 1981 LosAngeles

[1]See Table A3. Multiple plans are observed for 83 of the 125 districts. The largest number of programs (six) is observed in Little Rock, Orange County, Florida, and Mecklenburg County, North Carolina; another seven districts introduced five programs each.

plan and the 1976 plan in New Bedford, Massachusetts coincide with an increase in the dissimilarity index.

When districts implemented a series of plans in succeeding years (*e.g.*, Denver and Little Rock), it is not practical to distinguish between them. In such cases, we treat the series as a single plan and define an implementation window that encompasses the entire period. We classify 96 districts as having one major plan [2] and another 13 as having two major plans. Most dual-plan districts had a period of relative inactivity between two distinct desegregation programs, but there are exceptions; in Kansas City, Kansas, for example, elementary and secondary plans were enacted in separate years. A total of 122 major plans are analyzed in this section.

The objective is to examine changes in integration levels and white enrollment accompanying the introduction of major desegregation programs. We stratify by technique in order to identify plan types that achieve the greatest reduction in segregation and plan types that elicit the greatest enrollment response. The primary components of each major plan are classified as one of the following: pairing and clustering, pairing and clustering with rezoning, pairing and clustering with magnets, rezoning, rezoning with magnets, major voluntary, and other voluntary.[3]

A number of factors dictated the choice of categories and the classification of each plan. Voluntary and involuntary programs should be analyzed separately to assess the widespread sentiment that magnet programs minimize white flight. It is also desirable to distinguish between the later, large-scale voluntary plans—which are viewed as the modern alternative to mandatory reassignment—and the early, smaller programs. For this reason, large-scale magnet and transfer programs implemented in the absence of mandatory techniques are classified as major voluntary. Other voluntary refers to transfer and magnet programs (and one freedom of choice plan) that affected a relatively small proportion of students; five of the eight plans in this category pre-date the enrollment data. The two voluntary categories account for 22 plans. Another 12 plans that combined voluntary techniques with rezoning and/or pairing and clustering are analyzed separately.[4] In classifying mandatory techniques, a distinction is made be-

[2]This number includes the Indianapolis suburbs, which we analyze separately from the city district.

[3]Detailed descriptions of each plan technique appear in Section 3.

[4]The pairing and clustering with magnets category may also include rezoning. However, the rezoning with magnets category excludes plans that used pairing and clustering to any significant degree.

tween pairing and clustering and rezoning. Pairing and clustering typically involve busing students to nonadjacent schools, while rezoning alters attendance zones and usually requires less transportation. Plans using satellite rezoning and urban-suburban transfers (*e.g.*, New Castle County, Delaware and the 1981 Indianapolis plan) are classified as pairing and clustering, since they are closest in spirit to that technique. A large number of plans use significant amounts of both rezoning and pairing and clustering. Of the 88 pure mandatory plans, 37 combine techniques, while 34 rezone and 17 pair and cluster.

We also classify plans by their scope. The intent is to isolate plans that had a relatively large effect on the level of integration and assess the accompanying change in white enrollment. Since southern districts usually began their desegregation efforts with higher levels of segregation than nonsouthern districts, two definitions of "full scope" are applied. If a southern district initially had a dissimilarity index of 0.66 or higher and ended with an index of 0.40 or lower, the plan is considered to be full. For nonsouthern districts, the initial level of dissimilarity must be at least 0.50 and the ending level no higher than 0.40. These criteria yield 30 full plans in the South and 27 outside the South. Among the nonsouthern full plans, the smallest reduction in the dissimilarity is -0.16 in Rochester, and the second smallest is San Diego's -0.25. The smallest reduction among the southern districts is -0.27 in Prince George's County, Maryland, followed by -0.35 in Fayette County, Kentucky.

Table A3 (see Appendix A) lists all the plans implemented by the 108 districts and identifies the major plans. Table A4 groups the 122 major plans by plan type and district type (large urban, etc.) and indicates the region and scope. Table 16 summarizes the number of plans in each category.

In addition to using the strata shown in Table 16, we also classify plans by their implementation date. As described in Section 3, the 1971 *Swann* decision changed the nature of desegregation efforts by ordering large-scale busing. If implementation began in 1970 or earlier, the plan is classified as pre-Swann, while remaining plans fall into the post-Swann category. Of the 37 pre-Swann plans, only nine were implemented outside the South and the majority involved rezoning; 16 used only rezoning, and an additional 12 used rezoning with pairing and clustering. Three of the remaining pre-Swann plans used pairing and clustering, another one is classified as major voluntary, and five are classified as other voluntary.

TABLE 16

Number of Plans in Plan-Type and District-Type Category

		PAIR & CLUSTER		REZONE/ PAIR & CLUSTER		PAIR & CLUSTER MAGNETS		REZONE		REZONE/ MAGNETS		MAJOR VOLUN-TARY		OTHER VOLUN-TARY		TOTAL
		S	N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S	N	
LARGE URBAN	F		1		4		3				1		2			31
	P		2	4	2	1	2	2				1	5		1	
MEDIUM URBAN	F	1	1	1	2				3		1		2			26
	P	1	1	1	2			2	2				2		4	
SMALL URBAN	F	1	1	1	2				1				2			18
	P		3			1		1	2		1				2	
SUB-URBAN	F	1	1													5
	P							3								
RURAL	F			1				2								4
	P							1								
COUNTY-WIDE	F	2		14				5		1						38
	P		1	3				10		1				1		
TOTAL		17		37		7		34		5		1	4		8	122

Note: S=South (TOTAL=63 plans)
N=nonsouth (TOTAL=59 plans)
F=full plan (TOTAL=57 plans)
P=partial plan (TOTAL=65 plans)

6.2 An Illustration of the Calculations

For each group of plans, we compute a series of average changes in the dissimilarity index and average annual percent changes in white enrollment surrounding implementation.[52] The period surrounding plan implementation

[52]Although the results are not reported, we also computed changes in an alternative index of racial balance that is taken from the exposure measure. The normalized exposure index—also called the Coleman index—measures the districtwide average proportion of white students in schools attended by minorities relative to the districtwide proportion of students who are white. For example, if on average minority students attend schools where 30 percent of their classmates are white and if 50 percent of all students in the district are white, the normalized exposure index is 0.60 (0.30 divided by 0.50).

Other researchers argue that because the dissimilarity and normalize exposure indices measure different facets of integration, both should be reported. We find, however, that they are almost perfectly (negatively) correlated. For the groupings of plans that are

TABLE 17
Hypothetical Values to Illustrate Calculations of Changes in White Enrollment and Dissimilarity Index (Major Plan Implemented in Fall, 1976)

Implementation Period	Year	Fall Enrollment of White Students	Dissimilarity Index
More than one year before	1968	50,000	0.70
(6-year interval)	⋮		
	1974	44,000	0.65
One year before	1975	42,680	0.63
During	1976	38,412	0.40
One year after	1977	36,876	0.35
More than one year after	⋮		
(8-year interval)	1985	30,976	0.33

is divided into five phases. The change during implementation is computed from the year prior to implementation to the year of implementation (or the last year, in cases where an implementation window has been assigned). The period preceding implementation is divided into one year before and more than one year before (beginning with the first year for which data are available). The post-implementation period is divided into one year after and more than one year after.

To illustrate the format used to report the data, we consider a hypothetical district that introduced a desegregation plan in 1976. Assume that we have data on the numbers of white and minority students enrolled in each school from 1968 through 1985, so the dissimilarity index can be computed for each year. Table 17 provides the numbers that enter into our calculations.

In the hypothetical district, the observed period starts in 1968 with

reported in this section, the alternative index shows the same pattern as the dissimilarity index.

In addition to examining changes in white enrollment, we also examined changes in minority enrollment. We do not find patterns of change in minority enrollment, although more sophisticated analyses might succeed in doing so.

50,000 white students and a dissimilarity index of 0.70. In the six-year period between 1968 and 1974, enrollment falls 12 percent to 44,000 and the index falls to 0.65. The average annual change in white enrollment is -2.0 percent and the change in the index is -0.05 during the interval *more than one year before* implementation. Between 1974 and 1975, enrollment falls from 44,000 to 42,680 (three percent) and the index falls from 0.65 to 0.63 (0.02 points). These are the changes *one year before* implementation. Between 1975 and 1976, or *during* implementation, enrollment falls ten percent from 42,680 to 38,412 and the index falls from 0.63 to 0.40 (a decline of 0.23). Between 1976 and 1977, or *one year after* implementation, enrollment falls from 38,412 to 36,815 (a four percent loss) and the index falls by 0.05, from 0.40 to 0.35. In the period *more than one year after* implementation (the eight years between 1977 and 1985), enrollment falls from 36,815 to 30,976 (a 16 percent drop, for an annual average decline of two percent) and the dissimilarity index falls from 0.35 to 0.33 (a decline of 0.02).

In the tables that follow, these figures are averaged over groups of major plans. The display of averages is illustrated below, using the data for the single hypothetical district:

	Before		During	After	
	More Than One Year	One Year		One Year	More Than One Year
Index	-.050	-.020	-.230	-.050	-.020
Enrollment	-2.00	-3.00	-10.0	-4.00	-2.00
Departure from trend	—	-1.00	-8.00	-2.00	0.00
Cumulative departure	—	-1.00	-9.00	-11.0	-11.0

The numbers in the first two rows refer to changes in the dissimilarity index and white enrollment as described. Our main results (Tables 19–22) report only these two rows for various groupings by plan type, implementation period, region, and district type.

The final two rows of the illustration suggest a way to interpret enrollment changes. Until two years prior to implementation, white enrollment had been falling at an annual average rate of two percent. Using this rate as a naive forecast of the enrollment trend in the absence of a desegregation program, the third row gives estimated departures from trend in the years

surrounding implementation. We get these numbers by subtracting the -2.0 percent trend from subsequent changes. Thus, the -10.0 percent average annual change experienced during implementation is estimated to be a -8.0 percent departure from trend.

The final row of the illustration estimates the plan's cumulative effect. We observe a one percent departure from trend one year before implementation, an eight percent departure during implementation, and an additional two percent departure immediately following implementation. The cumulative loss in white enrollment during implementation is -9.0 percent (-1.0 plus -8.0) and it is -11.0 over the extended period. If we extrapolate the trend in white enrollment that was observed between 1968 and 1974, then the predicted enrollment in 1985 is 34,807 white students. Actual 1985 enrollment is 30,976, or 11.0 percent below the projected value.

We refer to this type of estimate as naive. Clearly, it is wrong if external forces would have resulted in accelerating losses. Examples of such forces include general demographic changes, falling birth rates, and population redistribution away from large central city districts. In these cases, naive forecasts overstate responses to desegregation programs. It is less clear that the naive projections distort *comparisons* of the effects of different types of plans, which is our primary objective.

In supplementary Tables 19a–22a, we provide calculations like the ones in the third row of the illustration. We do not provide calculations analogous to those in the final row showing cumulative departures from trend.[6]

6.3 Changes in White Enrollment and the Segregation Index

In reviewing these calculations, it should be noted that the trend in white enrollment was not uniform during the period studied. The baby boom resulted in births peaking in 1957 and the number of school-age youths peaking in the late 1960s. Although the timing varied regionally, white enrollment began to decline after the peak had passed and the rate of descent accelerated at least through the mid 1970s. Because of this general population trend, the averages show greater losses in white enrollment for plans that were implemented in later years.

A benchmark of changes in white enrollment is provided by Table 18,

[6]They are more problematic because not all intervals have equal width. The one year before and one year after changes refer to single years, but the during period is often more than one year. Obviously, the widths of the more than one year intervals also vary.

which reports aggregate national enrollment and percent changes in numbers of white students between 1966 and 1985. It should be noted that these figures also include Hispanic students. The reason is that the *Current Population Surveys*, from which these data are taken, classify almost all Hispanics as white, whereas the school enrollment data in all other tables define white as neither black, Hispanic, Asian, nor Native American.

The first column of Table 18 gives national white enrollment, measured in October of each year. The second column gives the change from the previous year expressed as a percentage. Beginning at the bottom and moving up, we see that enrollment rose in the late 1960s and then fell continuously from 1970 through 1980. In the most recent five-year period, the general pattern of decline continues to hold, but the year-to-year changes sometimes show minor increases. Between 1979 and 1980, there is a 0.43 percent increase and between 1984 and 1985, there is a 0.76 percent increase. During the 20 years, national enrollment reached a maximum in 1969 when 44.6 million white students were enrolled, and a minimum of 35.8 million students in 1984. Thus, there was a cumulative decline in white enrollment of 19.9 percent between 1969 and 1984. The largest single year drop is between 1977 and 1978, when enrollment fell 2.88 percent.

As we shall see, a drop in white enrollment as small as 2.88 percent during plan implementation is rare. Usually, a much larger decline is observed. The numbers in Table 18 refer to national trends, and not to specific public school districts which often display sharply divergent patterns. This phenomenon has already been demonstrated in Section 2, where losses in the large central city districts are highlighted.

The final two columns of Table 18 summarize patterns over five-year intervals. The third column reports the sum of the percentage changes for each of the five component years, while the last column gives the average annual change for the period. For example, between 1966 and 1970, enrollment increased at an average annual rate of 1.13 percent. It fell at a rate of 1.2 percent per year during the next five years. Over the five-year period between 1976 and 1980, enrollment shows the largest annual loss of 2.17 percent.

Tables 19–22 summarize average changes in the dissimilarity index and white enrollment surrounding implementation of major plans. We begin with fairly crude aggregates and proceed to finer strata. Table 19 shows average changes when all plans are combined together. Plans are then divided according to whether implementation occurred before or after the *Swann* decision and are subdivided by plan type. Table 20 is similar to Table 19,

TABLE 18

Trends in National Enrollment of White (Including Hispanic) Students in Public and Private Elementary and Secondary Schools, 1966-1985

Year	Total Enrollment (1,000 Students)	Annual Change (Percent)	Five Year Cumulative Change (Percent)	Five Year Annual Average Change (Percent)
1985	36,031	0.76	-3.06	-0.61
1984	35,758	-1.35		
1983	36,248	-0.83		
1982	36,551	-2.07		
1981	37,322	0.43		
1980	37,161	-2.15	-10.87	-2.17
1979	37,979	-2.30		
1978	38,873	-2.88		
1977	40,025	-2.07		
1976	40,871	-1.47		
1975	41,481	-0.93	-5.99	-1.20
1974	41,869	-0.80		
1973	42,206	-1.33		
1972	42,777	-2.60		
1971	43,920	-0.33		
1970	44,067	-1.28	5.65	1.13
1969	44,638	2.17		
1968	43,688	1.01		
1967	43,252	2.97		
1966	42,006	0.78		

Source: Current Population Reports P-20 Series (various issues).

but regional classifications (South and nonsouth) are added. Table 21 subdivides the plans even further. Plans are classified by the district's urban status as well as by region, plan type, and implementation date. Table 22 presents the same strata as Table 21, but averages only over plans that are full scope—that is, plans associated with the largest changes in the dissimilarity index. We adopt the convention in these tables of not reporting averages when there are fewer than three districts in a group.

It should be noted that Tables 19–22 show averages among heterogeneous districts. With the exception of Table 22, they mix programs that had relatively minor desegregative effects with programs that brought about major changes. Consider, for example, plans that combine pairing and clustering with rezoning. Table 19 shows that pre-Swann plans are associated with greater average changes in the dissimilarity index than are post-Swann plans. Even so, the 1970 plan in Dade County, Florida (Miami) shows a reduction of only 0.077, although the average for the 12 pre-Swann plans is 0.430. The average for the post-Swann plans is 0.250, but only four of 23 plans show changes smaller than the one for Dade County. Three show a change that is greater than the average reported for the pre-Swann plans.[7] The average enrollment changes also conceal a lot of diversity. For example, white enrollment in Memphis fell 36 percent when the 1973 plan (which used rezoning with pairing and clustering) was implemented; it had dropped 12 percent the year before and it fell another ten percent the year after implementation. The 1971 plan adopted in Dallas also involved rezoning with pairing and clustering and coincided with a nine percent decline in white enrollment. An average computed among large, southern districts using rezoning with pairing would combine the Memphis and Dallas experiences.

The districts become more homogeneous as we move to increasingly finer partitions in Tables 21 and 22. The averages in these tables are more sensitive to extreme (and perhaps anomalous) changes, however, because sample sizes are smaller. While we believe the patterns that emerge in Tables 19–22 should be taken seriously, the averages are discussed without regard to statistical confidence.

Turning to Table 19 we see that, among the 116 plans described in the top panel, the dissimilarity index falls an average of 0.217 during implementation

[7]Among the post-Swann plans using pairing and clustering with rezoning, the four showing the smallest change in the dissimilarity index are Sacramento in 1976 (.033), Atlanta in 1973 (.048), Fresno in 1978 (.048), and Tulsa in 1971 (.074). The three with the largest change are Dayton in 1976 (.464), Jefferson County, Kentucky in 1975 (.510), and Cleveland in 1979 (.654).

TABLE 19

Average Change in Dissimilarity Index and Average Annual Percent Change in White Enrollment Before, During, and After Plan Implementation by Plan Type and Implementation Date

Number	Type	Before		During	After	
		More Than One Year	One Year		One Year	More Than One Year
116	All:					
	Index	-.066	-.023	-.217	-.010	-.010
	Enrollment	-2.51	-3.76	-6.27	-4.58	-2.85
Pre-Swann (1970 or Earlier):						
3	Pair/Cluster:					
	Index	-.013	-.036	-.189	.045	.015
	Enrollment	-3.55	-2.17	-4.94	-9.35	-3.84
12	Rezone/Pair/Cluster:					
	Index	-.072	-.025	-.430	-.024	.026
	Enrollment	1.55	3.08	-2.20	-1.23	-1.76
17	Rezone:					
	Index	.001	-.036	-.247	-.014	-.047
	Enrollment	-.118	.795	-2.59	-1.53	-1.97
Post-Swann (1971 or Later):						
14	Pair/Cluster:					
	Index	-.051	-.025	-.209	-.007	.025
	Enrollment	-3.00	-4.32	-7.75	-5.48	-3.76
23	Rezone/Pair/Cluster:					
	Index	-.098	-.019	-.250	-.007	-.021
	Enrollment	-3.05	-6.68	-11.7	-7.29	-3.58
6	Pair/Cluster/Magnets:					
	Index	-.026	-.017	-.165	-.015	-.032
	Enrollment	-4.05	-6.29	-12.7	-7.85	-3.33
17	Rezone:					
	Index	-.062	-.038	-.178	-.004	.014
	Enrollment	-1.06	-2.86	-4.20	-2.87	-2.09
5	Rezone/Magnets:					
	Index	-.130	-.016	-.143	-.014	-.022
	Enrollment	-2.98	-2.13	-3.50	-3.39	.368
13	Major Voluntary:					
	Index	-.081	-.007	-.111	-.019	-.019
	Enrollment	-3.90	-6.72	-5.13	-6.09	-3.25
3	Other Voluntary:					
	Index	-.012	.000	-.038	-.032	.005
	Enrollment	-3.86	-10.2	-7.42	-7.11	-4.75

and by smaller amounts in the years before and after.[8] In contrast, the enrollment decline starts to accelerate before implementation. Enrollment drops more sharply during implementation than either before or after and the rate of enrollment loss is greater one year after implementation than one year before or more than one year after.

The national enrollment data presented in Table 18 show that losses were greater during the late 1970s than in earlier periods. It is not surprising, therefore, that enrollment losses are typically greater after implementation than before. But the fact that enrollment losses are greater *during* implementation than either before or after should remove any doubt about the existence of an enrollment response to desegregation. The pattern is clear: desegregation efforts lower the index of racial dissimilarity, and they also reduce enrollments of white students.

The remaining panels of Table 19 partition plans on the basis of implementation dates. The plans are further partitioned according to their primary techniques. In either period (before or after *Swann*) programs that combine rezoning with pairing and clustering are associated with the greatest changes in desegregation indices.

Table 19 shows that districts implementing rezoning with pairing and clustering plans prior to the *Swann* decision had been experiencing enrollment growth, on average, and that implementation coincided with a reversal in trend. These plans were introduced in 1969 or 1970, so the reversal in trend coincides with the nationwide transition from expanding to contracting enrollments (see Table 18). Because the timing of the reversal varied across districts, there are no obvious patterns in enrollment changes among plan types. This is not true for the post-Swann era, when enrollments are generally falling. All pairing and clustering plans (used in isolation or in combination with rezoning or magnets) are associated with the largest reductions in white enrollment. To underscore this point, Table 19a shows departures from trend obtained by subtracting the growth rate experienced more than one year before implementation from subsequent rates.

The finding that pairing and clustering leads to greater departures from trend than rezoning reflects qualitative differences between the two techniques. Although we classify both as mandatory, they differ in the degree to which they disrupt students' lives. There are cases where changes in attendance zones constitute more than minor interruptions. For the most part,

[8] Although we list 122 major plans in Table A4, six predate our enrollment data so the summaries in Tables 19–22 refer to 116 plans.

TABLE 19a
Departures from Trend in White Enrollment Loss by Plan Type
(Post-Swann Plans Only)

	Before		During	After	
Type	More Than One Year	One Year		One Year	More Than One Year
Pair/Cluster	—	-1.32	-4.75	-2.48	-0.76
Rezone/Pair/Cluster	—	-3.63	-8.65	-4.24	-0.53
Pair/Cluster/Magnets	—	-2.24	-8.65	-3.80	+0.72
Rezone	—	-1.80	-3.14	-1.81	-1.03
Rezone/Magnets	—	+0.85	-0.52	-0.41	+3.35
Major Voluntary	—	-2.82	-1.23	-2.19	+0.65
Other Voluntary	—	-6.34	-3.56	-3.25	-0.89

however, pairing and clustering require that greater distances be travelled.

A district's ability to desegregate its schools depends crucially on housing patterns. When the residential distance between whites and minorities is not great, desegregation can be achieved by readjusting attendance zones. As distance increases, rezoning becomes less feasible. The alternatives are magnets or mandatory reassignment via pairing and clustering. If we compare changes in dissimilarity indices between programs using pairing and clustering and those using voluntary techniques in Table 19, we see the greatest decreases associated with pairing and clustering and the smallest decreases associated with magnet programs. Pairing and clustering plans also differ dramatically from major voluntary programs in the enrollment response.

Table 20 is like Table 19 except that plans are subdivided by region (southern versus nonsouthern). Given the South's history of *de jure* segregation, we expect to see a major distinction. Table 20 reveals that plans implemented in the South generate larger reductions in the dissimilarity index than do nonsouthern plans. Responses in white enrollment do not vary dramatically across the two regions, although rezoning—used alone and with pairing and clustering—generates slightly greater white loss in the South. The pattern seen in Table 19 continues to hold: the greatest white loss occurs during implementation, and changes are more pronounced immediately

TABLE 20

Average Change in Dissimilarity Index and Average Annual Percent Change in White Enrollment Before, During, and After Plan Implementation by Plan Type and Implementation Date

Number	Type	Before		During	After	
		More Than One Year	One Year		One Year	More Than One Year
Southern Districts; Pre-Swann:						
11	Resone/Pair/Cluster:					
	Index	-.077	-.032	-.437	-.030	.039
	Enrollment	2.04	3.35	-2.14	-.920	-1.49
16	Resone:					
	Index	-.002	-.036	-.254	-.011	-.036
	Enrollment	.671	.639	-2.44	-1.75	-1.91
Southern Districts; Post-Swann:						
5	Pair/Cluster:					
	Index	-.114	-.032	-.361	.006	.064
	Enrollment	-1.65	-4.79	-8.38	-6.43	-3.56
12	Resone/Pair/Cluster:					
	Index	-.099	-.020	-.273	-.010	.005
	Enrollment	-2.49	-5.46	-12.7	-7.89	-3.40
10	Resone:					
	Index	-.055	-.042	-.228	.001	.041
	Enrollment	-.260	-2.59	-4.28	-2.37	-1.83
Non-Southern Districts; Post-Swann:						
9	Pair/Cluster:					
	Index	-.011	-.020	-.125	-.014	.004
	Enrollment	-3.97	-4.03	-7.40	-4.96	-3.87
11	Resone/Pair/Cluster:					
	Index	-.098	-.017	-.226	-.004	-.053
	Enrollment	-3.77	-8.15	-10.6	-6.64	-3.81
4	Pair/Cluster/Magnets:					
	Index	-.042	-.030	-.173	-.014	-.025
	Enrollment	-4.69	-8.66	-14.3	-8.50	-3.20
7	Resone:					
	Index	-.071	-.031	-.106	-.009	-.024
	Enrollment	-2.09	-3.32	-4.10	-3.58	-2.46
3	Resone/Magnets:					
	Index	-.110	-.010	-.117	-.034	-.027
	Enrollment	-3.44	-4.04	-5.56	-6.54	-2.96
Non-Southern Districts; Post-Swann:						
12	Major Voluntary:					
	Index	-.085	-.007	-.117	-.019	-.014
	Enrollment	-3.42	-6.66	-4.99	-5.58	-2.93
3	Other Voluntary:					
	Index	-.012	.000	-.038	-.032	.005
	Enrollment	-3.86	-10.3	-7.42	-7.11	-4.75

TABLE 20a
Departures from Trend in White Enrollment Loss by Plan Type
(Post-Swann Plans in Nonsouthern Districts Only*)

	Before		During	After	
Type	More Than One Year	One Year		One Year	More Than One Year
Pair/Cluster	–	-0.06	-3.43	-0.99	+0.10
Rezone/Pair/Cluster	–	-4.38	-6.83	-2.87	-0.04
Pair/Cluster/Magnets	–	-3.97	-9.61	-3.81	+1.49
Rezone	–	-1.23	-2.01	-1.49	-0.37
Rezone/Magnets	–	-0.60	-2.12	-3.10	+0.48
Major Voluntary	–	-3.24	-1.57	-2.16	+0.49

*Other voluntary plans are deleted since they are the same as those shown in Table 19a.

before and after than in more distant periods.

Table 20a measures changes in white enrollment as departures from trend for nonsouthern, post-Swann plans. There are no surprises in this table. Departures from trend in white enrollment are much larger in districts using pairing and clustering than in districts using other techniques. As Table 20 shows, these plans also cause the greatest changes in the dissimilarity index in both regions. Greater enrollment responses occur when pairing and clustering are combined with rezoning or magnets than when they are used in isolation.

Table 21 subdivides the plans even further by identifying the type of district. The southern, countywide districts[9] are particularly interesting because their greater geographic spread provides a buffer against white flight. Not only is there less opportunity for short-distance migration, but the districts typically encompass suburban areas where white students are concentrated. In some ways, however, desegregation is more difficult in these districts. It is likely that white and minority students are separated by greater distances, so transportation costs are greater.

In comparing white enrollment changes more than one year prior to implementation during the post-Swann era, different population trends are evident. Among countywide districts using rezoning, white enrollment had

[9]Of the 35 countywide districts in the sample, only one, Clark County (Las Vegas) Nevada is not in the South.

TABLE 21

Average Change in Dissimilarity Index and Average Annual Percent Change in White Enrollment Before, During, and After Plan Implementation by Plan Type and Implementation Date

Number	Type	Before		During	After	
		More Than One Year	One Year		One Year	More Than One Year
Countywide Southern Districts; Pre-Swann:						
10	Rezone/Pair/Cluster:					
	Index	-.088	-.034	-.442	-.037	.050
	Enrollment	2.04	3.04	-2.50	-.835	-1.55
11	Rezone:					
	Index	-.002	-.043	-.248	-.008	-.050
	Enrollment	4.30	2.00	-.787	-.199	-.898
Countywide Southern Districts; Post-Swann:						
5	Rezone/Pair/Cluster:					
	Index	-.122	-.034	-.373	.003	.005
	Enrollment	-.113	-2.56	-7.86	-4.47	-1.94
4	Rezone:					
	Index	-.061	-.028	-.356	.020	.087
	Enrollment	-.073	-4.62	-5.45	-.970	-1.38
Large Urban Southern Districts; Post-Swann:						
4	Rezone/Pair/Cluster:					
	Index	-.047	-.015	-.147	-.012	.034
	Enrollment	-5.48	-10.6	-20.4	-11.6	-5.33
Large Urban Nonsouthern Districts; Post-Swann:						
3	Pair/Cluster:					
	Index	-.004	-.045	-.148	-.014	-.009
	Enrollment	-8.27	-6.25	-13.2	-9.74	-6.54
6	Rezone/Pair/Cluster:					
	Index	-.085	-.019	-.222	-.013	-.103
	Enrollment	-4.40	-9.83	-10.7	-7.53	-4.51
4	Pair/Cluster/Magnets:					
	Index	-.042	-.030	-.173	-.014	-.025
	Enrollment	-4.69	-8.66	-14.3	-8.50	-3.20
7	Major Voluntary:					
	Index	-.035	-.002	-.132	-.017	-.035
	Enrollment	-3.67	-7.39	-5.47	-7.05	-3.99
Medium Urban Nonsouthern Districts; Post-Swann:						
4	Rezone/Pair/Cluster:					
	Index	-.107	-.019	-.211	.011	.005
	Enrollment	-2.96	-6.39	-10.2	-5.91	-3.05
4	Rezone:					
	Index	-.087	-.030	-.174	-.005	-.041
	Enrollment	-1.70	-3.32	-4.41	-4.18	-2.33
4	Major Voluntary:					
	Index	-.139	-.023	-.087	-.016	.011
	Enrollment	-3.02	-5.20	-4.01	-5.07	-2.98

TABLE 21 (Continued)
Average Change in Dissimilarity Index and Average Annual Percent Change in White Enrollment Before, During, and After Plan Implementation by Plan Type and Implementation Date

Number	Type	Before		During	After	
		More Than One Year	One Year		One Year	More Than One Year
Small Urban Nonsouthern Districts; Post-Swann:						
3	Pair/Cluster:					
	Index	-.054	-.010	-.097	.002	.006
	Enrollment	-2.33	-3.54	-5.48	-3.53	-4.24
3	Rezone:					
	Index	-.050	-.033	-.016	-.015	-.002
	Enrollment	-2.60	-3.32	-3.68	-2.79	-2.63

been falling at an average annual rate of only 0.07 percent. Among those using rezoning with pairing and clustering, it had been falling at a rate of only 0.11 percent. The apparent pre-plan stability of white enrollment in the countywide districts stands in sharp contrast to the pre-plan trend in large, urban, southern districts, where losses average 5.48 percent annually.

Table 21 demonstrates that desegregation plans in the countywide districts had an exceedingly large desegregative effect. The average changes in the dissimilarity index during implementation are larger for these districts than for any other group.

Departures from trend in white enrollment are shown in Table 21a. Among countywide districts, it remains true that departures from enrollment trend are greater for the pairing and clustering plans than for those using rezoning only, but the distinction between them is less pronounced than for other strata. The enrollment response to pairing and clustering is smaller for countywide districts than for large urban districts. The four large urban southern districts that used pairing and clustering with rezoning show the greatest losses in white enrollment. The average cumulative loss (from one year before to one year after implementation) is 26.2 percent, yet the change in the dissimilarity index is not large relative to other groups. Since white enrollment is falling rapidly in such areas, it may be that desegregation plans accelerate movements that would have occurred in any case. However, the evidence for such a response—an initial acceleration in

white loss followed by subsequent deceleration—is not observed. The pace of white enrollment loss increases one year before, during, and one year after implementation, but the subsequent trend (more than one year after) does not differ from the one that preceded the programs (a 5.33 average annual loss versus a 5.48 loss).

Table 21 shows a sharp contrast between post-Swann pairing and clustering and major voluntary plans among large urban districts outside the South. Plans using pairing and clustering achieve a greater desegregation response but the difference between them and the major voluntary plans is not very dramatic (-0.148, -0.222, and -0.173 versus -0.132). However, the departure from trend in white enrollment (Table 21a) is significantly greater for the mandatory plans than for the major voluntary plans.

Table 22 (and its companion Table 22a) is restricted to plans that had the largest effect on segregation levels. The first panel of Table 22 shows the averages over all such plans. While, by construction, these plans caused a greater response in the dissimilarity index than the full sample (Table 19), they show a *smaller* average change in white enrollment.

Thirteen of the 18 pre-Swann plans underlying Table 22 occurred in the South where the history of *de jure* segregation virtually assured that simple rezoning would produce large desegregation responses. Twelve of the 13 southern plans were implemented by countywide districts where enrollment responses tend to be less pronounced. These characteristics are partly responsible for the apparent ability of pre-Swann full plans to achieve large desegregative effects with relatively minor enrollment responses.

6.4 Additional Comments

Our examination of 116 major plans addresses two questions. Are school districts desegregating? Do desegregation efforts influence the movement of students between school districts? The answer to the first question is that racial balance improves when desegregation plans are implemented. Regarding the second question, we find that most of the districts in our sample experienced reductions in white enrollment during the period studied (from the late 1960s to 1984) and that losses of white students usually accelerate when desegregation plans are introduced.

We use the dissimilarity index as a measure of racial balance and find that it declined during the period under study for 117 of the 125 districts in our sample. The largest change, a reduction of 0.81, was seen in Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, and the index fell by more than 0.60 in ten

TABLE 21a

Departures from Trend in White Enrollment Loss
by Region, District Type, Plan Type and Implementation Date

	Before		During	After	
Type	More Than One Year	One Year		One Year	More Than One Year
Countywide Southern Districts Pre-Swann:					
Rezone/Pair/Cluster	—	+1.00	- 4.54	-2.88	-3.59
Rezone	—	-2.30	- 5.09	-4.50	5.20
Countywide Southern Districts Post-Swann:					
Rezone/Pair/Cluster	—	-2.45	- 7.75	-4.36	-1.83
Rezone	—	-4.55	- 5.38	-0.90	-1.31
Large Urban Southern Districts Post-Swann:					
Rezone/Pair/Cluster	—	-5.12	-14.92	-6.12	+0.1
Large Urban Non-Southern Districts Post-Swann:					
Pair/Cluster	—	+2.02	- 4.93	-1.47	+1.73
Rezone/Pair/Cluster	—	-5.43	- 6.30	-3.13	-0.11
Pair/Cluster/Magnets	—	-3.97	- 9.61	-3.81	+1.49
Major Voluntary	—	-3.72	- 1.80	-3.38	-0.32
Medium Non-Southern Districts Post-Swann:					
Rezone/Pair/Cluster	—	-3.43	- 7.24	-2.95	-0.09
Rezone	—	-1.62	- 2.71	-2.48	-0.63
Major Voluntary	—	-2.18	- 0.99	-2.05	+0.04
Small Urban Non-Southern Districts Post-Swann:					
Pair/Cluster	—	-1.21	- 3.15	-1.20	-1.91
Rezone	—	-0.72	- 1.08	-0.19	-0.03

TABLE 22

Average Change in Dissimilarity Index and Average Annual Percent Change in White Enrollment Before, During, and After Plan Implementation by Plan Type and Implementation Date

Number	Type	Before		During	After	
		More Than One Year	One Year		One Year	More Than One Year
54	All:					
	Index	-.096	-.029	-.323	-.011	-.008
	Enrollment	-1.63	-2.88	-5.65	-4.12	-2.53
18	All Pre-Swann:					
	Index	-.044	-.026	-.396	-.014	-.008
	Enrollment	1.13	1.70	-1.63	-1.21	-1.65
36	All Post-Swann:					
	Index	-.111	-.030	-.289	-.009	-.007
	Enrollment	-2.21	-4.63	-7.66	-5.49	-2.96
Southern Countywide Districts; Pre-Swann:						
7	Rezone/Pair/Cluster:					
	Index	-.109	-.038	-.489	-.046	.023
	Enrollment	2.41	3.63	-1.28	.240	-1.16
3	Rezone:					
	Index	-.009	-.010	-.453	-.009	.040
	Enrollment	4.30	1.33	1.67	2.08	.583
Southern Countywide Districts; Post-Swann:						
5	Rezone/Pair/Cluster:					
	Index	-.122	-.034	-.373	.003	.005
	Enrollment	-.113	-2.56	-7.86	-4.47	-1.94
Large Urban Nonsouthern Districts; Post-Swann:						
4	Rezone/Pair/Cluster:					
	Index	-.100	-.020	-.248	-.005	-.138
	Enrollment	-3.73	-10.6	-10.7	-6.85	-4.43

TABLE 22a

Departures from Trend in White Enrollment Loss
by Region, District Type, Plan Type and Implementation Date

Type	Before		During	After	
	More Than One Year	One Year		One Year	More Than One Year
All	—	-1.25	-4.02	-2.49	-0.90
All Pre-Swann	—	+0.57	-2.76	-2.34	-2.78
All Post-Swann	—	-2.42	-5.45	-3.28	-0.75
Southern Countywide Districts Pre-Swann:					
Rezone/Pair/Cluster	—	+1.22	-3.69	-2.17	-3.57
Rezone	—	-2.97	-2.63	-2.22	-3.72
Southern Countywide Districts Post-Swann:					
Rezone/Pair/Cluster	—	-2.45	-7.75	-4.36	-1.83
Large Urban Non-Southern Districts Post-Swann:					
Rezone/Pair/Cluster	—	-6.87	-6.97	-3.12	-0.70

additional districts. The dissimilarity index increased in the remaining eight districts (see Table 12). Five of these districts apparently did not implement a desegregation plan and two others undertook voluntary efforts during the 1960s (so that effects of the programs pre-date the period for which we have data). In the eighth district—Raleigh County, West Virginia—the dissimilarity index rose by 0.11 points despite a 1973 rezoning plan. This increase is small relative to changes seen elsewhere; in fact, 100 districts experienced a decline of more than 0.11 points. Tables 19–22 show that the most pronounced improvements in integration levels occurred when desegregation programs were adopted.

On average, the dissimilarity index also fell during the post-plan period (more than one year after implementation) by 0.01 points. However, the index rose during this period for 18 of the partitions in Tables 19–22. Southern, countywide districts with post-Swann rezoning plans show the largest average increase (0.087), while southern, pairing and clustering, post-Swann plans show the second largest increase (0.64).

Turning to individual districts, we find that 51 experienced a rise in the dissimilarity index in the years following a major plan.[10] For the most part, erosion is minor relative to the changes that coincide with plan implementation, but the dissimilarity index rose by as much as 0.19 in Richland County, South Carolina and by 0.18 in Muscogee County, Georgia (and by over 0.10 in seven other districts). It is not easy to characterize the districts that experienced post-plan erosion. The dissimilarity index rose during implementation in five districts, but in only two—Raleigh County, West Virginia and Oakland, California—did the index also rise in subsequent years. Of the 51 districts experiencing post-plan erosion, 32 are in the South and 33 implemented their major plan in the post-Swann era. Only six districts are classified as large urban, while a disproportionately large number (21) are countywide. Pairing (with or without rezoning) was used in 31 of the districts, rezoning was used in 13, and only seven relied on voluntary techniques.

The coincidental timing of increased integration and decreased white enrollment has led researchers to speculate that resegregation is occurring. That is, desegregation efforts might trigger such a large exodus of white students that racial isolation actually increases. We find that this is not the overall effect of desegregation efforts. As Tables 5–7 show, on a national level, blacks and whites in public schools were more likely to attend

[10]Since we identify 122 major plans in 109 districts (with Indianapolis and its suburbs counted separately) this implies that 58 districts did not experience post-plan erosion.

integrated schools in 1980 than they were in 1968. Tables 3–4 provide evidence that there is not a nationwide trend toward enrollment in private and parochial schools. These national trends do not preclude the possibility that segregation is increasing in particular cases. However, our examination of 125 school districts shows that most have improved their racial balance (as measured by the dissimilarity index).

The dissimilarity index may be an inappropriate measure of integration when the districtwide racial mix of students is at issue. It takes as given the proportion of students in a district who are white and the proportion of students who are minority. One of the problems with the index is that it would show improvement if a plan were to generate white flight provided that those who leave had been attending the most segregated schools. An alternative measure of integration is the unnormalized index of the exposure of minorities to white classmates. It measures the average fraction of classmates who are white in schools minorities attend. A property of this index is that it falls as the districtwide proportion of white students falls unless the remaining whites are increasingly evenly distributed among schools. Although changes in the exposure index resemble those described for the dissimilarity index during plan implementation, long-run trends in the two indices sometimes differ when districts undergo large shifts in their racial mix.

The exposure index, together with the districtwide percentage of white students, can often give additional insight into the effects of desegregation efforts. Two cases are unambiguous. If, for example, the percentage of white students increases and the exposure index declines, then the integrative outcome is clearly negative. Increased representation of whites creates an opportunity that is not realized; instead, minority students are increasingly isolated. There are no districts in our sample that exhibit this pattern.

The second unambiguous situation occurs when the exposure index increases despite a decrease in the percentage of students who are white. Whether the fall in white representation is partially a response to desegregation programs or simply a reflection of demographic trends may remain unknown (and a question of concern). The outcome, however, is clear: minority students have the opportunity for increased interracial contact. We find that 74 districts in the sample fall into this category.

In six districts studied, white representation increased and minority exposure to white classmates also increased. In the remaining 45 districts, both the exposure index and the fraction of students who are white fell. Fourteen of these districts are among the 16 we classify as not having imple-

mented a desegregation plan. We assume that declining exposure in these districts results from demographic shifts that are unrelated to desegregation efforts.

Thus, there are only 31 districts that implemented a desegregation plan and also experienced a decline in the exposure index. In 11 of these districts, the plan either predates the enrollment data (so effects are unobserved) or was relatively small in scale (i.e., less than a 0.05 point reduction in the dissimilarity index during implementation). Since the plans in these 11 districts had small or unobserved effects, it is unlikely that reduced exposure is due to white flight. Again, we assume it is predominantly due to factors other than desegregation efforts.

The remaining 20 districts that experienced declining exposure indices and declining white representation also implemented plans that reduced the dissimilarity index by more than 0.05. The decreases in white enrollment were unusually pronounced in these districts. For example, the fraction of students who are white fell by 50 points in Prince George's County, Maryland, by 46 points in Long Beach, by 44 points in Pasadena, and by 41 points in Boston. To determine how much of the reduced exposure is due to demographic trends and how much reflects a white flight response to desegregation programs would require projections of enrollment in the absence of the programs.

7. Suggestions for Further Research

The main purpose of this project was to produce a data set that will support analyses of school desegregation programs. This section outlines the types of studies that can be performed with the data base. Most of the issues have been explored previously, but past research relied on data for 1968 through 1974, and occasionally for 1976. For most districts in our sample we have added enrollment data for 1975 and 1977 through 1984. In a large number of cases, data for 1967 and 1985 are also included. Not only are there more data, but the data are more current and, presumably, more relevant to contemporary concerns.

The data base provides enrollments for individual schools and distinguishes whites from blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and Native Americans. Future studies can address determinants of districtwide enrollment for specific race or ethnic groups or they can examine measures of interracial exposure. Specific schools or subsets of schools can be identified and traced through time. Partitioning of this type is particularly useful when a district has adopted a partial program or when the techniques vary between schools.

In addition to the school enrollment data, we have compiled a complete list of desegregation plans implemented in the 125 districts studied. The list includes descriptive information concerning the plans' main features. Researchers can use this information to determine which plans work and which do not both in avoiding white flight and in facilitating interracial contact. The primary research issue is to distinguish specific features of plans from potentially confounding factors. We categorize the issues to be considered into three groups:

- What are the factors other than school desegregation programs that contribute to the racial composition of public elementary and secondary schools? Factors include general demographics—birth and migration rates—along with a school's or a school district's location within a larger metropolitan area. For example, is areawide growth contributing to the emergence of racially isolated pockets? Are these pockets congruent with a school district's boundaries? Because the emphasis is on public schools, the factors also include income inequality and religion, since these contribute to enrollment in private and parochial schools.

- What factors other than plan details contribute to a school district's ability to integrate? This list begins with the segregative history of an area or, more appropriately, with the attitudes that fostered it.

The list extends to the racial mix of a district in order to address the issue of tipping. Is it easier to integrate a system where blacks, Hispanics and other traditional minorities do not represent a majority of all students? The list also includes residential segregation and socioeconomic heterogeneity. Is school integration easier when white and minority populations have similar educational backgrounds, occupations and incomes?

- What types of desegregation plans work? Plans can be classified (as in this report) by technique, scope, and implementation date. Is the ordering of plan effectiveness lexicographic or does effectiveness vary with specific characteristics of school districts like those described above?

Appendix A
Data for Selected Metropolitan Areas and All Districts in the Sample

Table A1 lists the 45 large, urban areas that are aggregated in Table 1 (Section 2). For each urban area, the fraction of public school students who are white is given for both the central city districts and the suburban districts, for 1968 and 1980.

Table A2 lists the 125 districts in our sample, alphabetically by state. For each district, total enrollment, the percent minority, and the dissimilarity index are given for the first and last years.

Table A3 lists the 125 districts in our sample, alphabetically by state. For each district, the implementation year and components of most desegregation plans are listed, along with the change in the dissimilarity index at the time of implementation.

Table A4 list the 122 major plans and the 17 districts that did not implement a desegregation plan. The plans are grouped by plan type and district type; the implementation year, scope, and region are also identified.

TABLE A1

White Students as a Percentage of Total Enrollments in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools for Selected Metropolitan Areas by Central City and Suburban Status, 1968 and 1980

Metropolitan Area	Central City Districts		Suburban Districts	
	1968	1980	1968	1980
	— Percentages —			
Northeast				
New York	43.9	26.3	90.6	82.3
Philadelphia	38.7	28.7	91.5	85.7
Pittsburgh	60.3	49.1	96.3	95.2
Newark	18.1	9.2	87.5	75.1
Buffalo	60.9	46.6	96.5	95.3
Syracuse	78.5	64.4	99.5	97.8
North Central				
Chicago	37.7	18.7	92.6	83.4
Detroit	39.3	12.2	93.2	89.6
Cleveland	42.5	27.9	95.9	90.3
St. Louis	36.2	20.9	94.0	85.2
Minneapolis, St. Paul	89.9	71.2	99.4	96.7
Cincinnati	56.7	42.1	96.5	92.4
Milwaukee, Racine	73.0	45.3	99.1	97.0
Kansas City	56.0	36.2	99.1	94.3
Columbus	73.8	59.4	98.0	96.7
Indianapolis	66.3	49.4	99.2	97.3
Dayton	61.5	42.7	97.1	95.9
Toledo	70.8	61.7	95.4	95.2
Akron	74.0	64.1	96.2	91.3
Gary, Hammond, E. Chicago	46.0	26.2	99.1	96.4
South				
District of Columbia	5.6	3.6	89.4	70.0
Houston	53.3	25.2	83.5	73.9
Dallas, Ft. Worth	63.3	34.9	94.2	87.4
Baltimore	34.9	21.4	92.4	86.3
Atlanta	38.2	8.4	90.3	82.4
New Orleans	31.3	11.7	80.4	72.5
Norfolk, Virginia Beach, Portsmouth	65.1	61.9	72.0	64.3
San Antonio	26.9	11.0	44.7	42.4
Memphis	46.3	24.0	60.4	72.7
Birmingham	48.6	23.6	71.6	78.3
Oklahoma City	78.2	55.1	94.2	85.6

TABLE A1 (Continued)
White Students as a Percentage of Total Enrollments
in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools
for Selected Metropolitan Areas by
Central City and Suburban Status, 1968 and 1980

Metropolitan Area	Central City Districts		Suburban Districts	
	1968	1980	1968	1980
	— Percentages —			
South, continued				
Greensboro, Winston, Salem, High Point	68.5	51.8	80.5	76.8
Nashville, Davidson	75.8	65.3	87.9	91.1
Tulsa	83.0	69.4	90.5	83.2
West				
Los Angeles, Long Beach	53.7	23.9	75.4	45.5
San Francisco, Oakland	36.8	15.5	85.2	73.0
Seattle, Everett	82.2	56.6	97.6	91.7
San Jose	67.9	63.8	83.3	65.0
San Diego	76.1	55.3	84.0	66.0
Anaheim, Santa Ana, Garden Grove	84.4	57.0	91.0	79.2
Denver, Boulder	65.6	40.8	93.7	87.8
Phoenix	65.3	52.0	80.6	74.4
Portland	89.5	75.5	98.3	94.3
Sacramento	66.2	46.4	87.7	79.2
Riverside, Ontario, San Bernardino	74.5	58.2	83.0	76.4

Source: See the note to Table 1.

73

TABLE A2

Enrollment and Integration Levels During First and Last Periods

State	District	Year		Total Enrollment	Percent minority	Dissimilarity Index
Alabama	Birmingham					
		FIRST:	1967	67,858	51.0	0.93
		LAST:	1984	44,045	81.4	0.74
	Jefferson County (Excl. Birmingham)					
		FIRST:	1968	65,328	27.8	0.97
		LAST:	1985	46,259	16.2	0.46
	Mobile					
		FIRST:	1968	75,946	41.3	0.89
		LAST:	1985	68,213	43.8	0.59
Arizona	Mesa					
		FIRST:	1968	18,729	15.7	0.27
		LAST:	1985	46,811	14.4	0.22
	Tucson					
		FIRST:	1968	53,667	32.4	0.69
		LAST:	1985	53,083	43.1	0.47
Arkansas	Little Rock					
		FIRST:	1967	24,513	34.7	0.81
		LAST:	1985	19,299	72.4	0.29
California	Compton					
		FIRST:	1970	40,364	94.8	0.65
		LAST:	1985	27,138	99.5	0.43
	Fremont					
		FIRST:	1968	31,622	13.4	0.28
		LAST:	1984	24,037	23.7	0.17
	Fresno					
		FIRST:	1968	58,234	30.0	0.51
		LAST:	1985	55,512	56.0	0.45
	Hayward					
		FIRST:	1968	29,303	24.2	0.25
		LAST:	1984	17,171	46.6	0.16
	Long Beach					
		FIRST:	1967	72,760	14.2	0.59
		LAST:	1985	63,824	60.5	0.26
	Los Angeles					
		FIRST:	1968	653,549	46.3	0.73
		LAST:	1984	583,044	79.9	0.60
	Modesto					
		FIRST:	1968	21,269	12.7	0.37
		LAST:	1985	22,325	30.9	0.34
	Norwalk					
		FIRST:	1968	32,448	22.1	0.30
		LAST:	1985	18,500	57.0	0.32

TABLE A2 (Continued)
Enrollment and Integration Levels During First and Last Periods

State	District	Year		Total Enrollment	Percent minority	Dissimilarity Index
California	Oakland					
		FIRST:	1963	61,130	56.0	0.60
		LAST:	1984	52,724	89.1	0.63
	Pasadena					
		FIRST:	1967	31,780	36.9	0.58
		LAST:	1985	22,380	76.6	0.16
	Richmond					
		FIRST:	1970	41,492	36.2	0.45
		LAST:	1984	27,319	62.4	0.42
	Sacramento					
		FIRST:	1965	50,743	30.7	0.39
		LAST:	1984	41,887	57.8	0.28
	San Bernardino					
		FIRST:	1967	41,615	32.8	0.56
		LAST:	1985	30,595	53.4	0.22
	San Diego					
		FIRST:	1966	120,994	22.6	0.60
		LAST:	1985	111,352	53.6	0.34
	San Francisco					
		FIRST:	1968	94,154	58.8	0.41
		LAST:	1984	62,696	83.4	0.32
	San Jose					
		FIRST:	1968	35,417	32.1	0.60
		LAST:	1985	30,231	44.1	0.46
	San Lorenzo					
		FIRST:	1967	18,480	14.6	0.22
		LAST:	1985	7,458	35.9	0.13
	Santa Clara					
		FIRST:	1967	23,734	20.3	0.18
		LAST:	1985	12,437	41.9	0.19
	Vallejo					
		FIRST:	1968	16,222	32.7	0.31
		LAST:	1985	15,270	58.1	0.24
Colorado	Denver					
		FIRST:	1967	96,420	33.4	0.62
		LAST:	1985	59,128	82.4	0.24
	Pueblo					
		FIRST:	1968	26,139	39.4	0.42
		LAST:	1985	18,700	50.4	0.31
Connecticut	Hartford					
		FIRST:	1967	26,842	54.7	0.64
		LAST:	1984	23,568	88.3	0.59

TABLE A2 (Continued)
Enrollment and Integration Levels During First and Last Periods

State	District	Year	Total Enrollment	Percent minority	Dissimilarity Index
Connecticut	Stamford				
		FIRST: 1967	20,266	20.4	0.52
		LAST: 1985	11,508	46.3	0.08
Delaware	New Castle County (Wilmington)				
		FIRST: 1968	80,753	17.8	0.80
		LAST: 1984	52,602	32.5	0.15
Florida	Brevard County (Melbourne)				
		FIRST: 1968	61,342	10.8	0.46
		LAST: 1984	45,506	16.9	0.31
	Broward County (Ft. Lauderdale)				
		FIRST: 1967	95,244	19.5	0.82
		LAST: 1984	25,168	32.7	0.40
	Dade County (Miami)				
		FIRST: 1968	232,465	41.7	0.67
		LAST: 1985	233,671	74.4	0.52
	Duval County (Jacksonville)				
		FIRST: 1968	122,637	28.2	0.87
		LAST: 1984	98,812	39.0	0.39
	Hillsborough County (Tampa)				
		FIRST: 1967	94,696	19.8	0.84
		LAST: 1983	109,770	26.4	0.27
	Lee County (Fort Myers)				
		FIRST: 1968	17,808	20.6	0.76
		LAST: 1984	31,463	21.1	0.24
	Orange County (Orlando)				
		FIRST: 1968	76,089	17.2	0.84
		LAST: 1985	82,357	32.1	0.42
	Palm Beach County (W. Palm Beach)				
		FIRST: 1968	61,715	30.4	0.77
		LAST: 1984	74,672	36.8	0.48
	Pinellas County (St. Petersburg)				
		FIRST: 1968	78,466	16.8	0.78
		LAST: 1984	76,809	18.7	0.27
	Polk County (Lakeland)				
		FIRST: 1968	52,255	22.7	0.74
		LAST: 1985	56,637	21.8	0.38
	Volusia County (Daytona Beach)				
		FIRST: 1968	32,275	22.7	0.74
		LAST: 1984	37,623	21.3	0.30
Georgia	Atlanta				
		FIRST: 1968	111,219	61.8	0.91
		LAST: 1985	66,072	93.0	0.76

TABLE A2 (Continued)
Enrollment and Integration Levels During First and Last Periods

State	District	Year	Total Enrollment	Percent minority	Dissimilarity Index
Georgia	Dougherty County (Albany)				
		FIRST: 1966	24,772	37.3	0.94
		LAST: 1985	19,499	63.0	0.30
	Muscogee County (Columbus)				
		FIRST: 1968	42,373	30.2	0.90
		LAST: 1985	29,674	48.3	0.36
Illinois	Chicago				
		FIRST: 1968	582,274	62.3	0.81
		LAST: 1985	430,435	85.8	0.69
	East St. Louis				
		FIRST: 1968	23,156	71.6	0.77
		LAST: 1985	20,142	97.8	0.80
	Rockford				
		FIRST: 1969	42,826	12.1	0.69
		LAST: 1985	27,273	26.8	0.36
Indiana	Fort Wayne				
		FIRST: 1968	41,595	14.9	0.75
		LAST: 1985	32,334	25.5	0.36
	Gary				
		FIRST: 1968	48,431	71.0	0.81
		LAST: 1985	28,776	97.3	0.59
	Indianapolis				
		FIRST: 1968	108,587	33.7	0.77
		LAST: 1984	52,017	47.2	0.19
	South Bend				
		FIRST: 1968	37,310	16.7	0.63
		LAST: 1985	21,671	32.4	0.18
Kansas	Kansas City				
		FIRST: 1968	35,047	32.1	0.67
		LAST: 1985	23,123	55.0	0.31
	Wichita				
		FIRST: 1967	69,457	14.4	0.68
		LAST: 1984	43,966	28.9	0.17
Kentucky	Fayette County (Lexington)				
		FIRST: 1968	34,867	17.3	0.66
		LAST: 1985	30,238	22.7	0.31
	Jefferson County (Louisville)				
		FIRST: 1968	141,058	20.4	0.79
		LAST: 1984	90,963	31.1	0.19

TABLE A2 (Continued)
Enrollment and Integration Levels During First and Last Periods

State	District	Year	Total Enrollment	Percent minority	Dissimilarity Index
Louisiana	Caddo Parish (Shreveport)				
		FIRST: 1968	61,400	43.3	0.97
		LAST: 1985	50,173	54.2	0.49
	Calcasieu Parish (Lake Charles)				
		FIRST: 1967	37,983	25.9	0.92
		LAST: 1985	31,632	29.6	0.64
	East Baton Rouge Parish				
		FIRST: 1968	63,725	37.6	0.93
		LAST: 1985	56,586	51.8	0.34
	Jefferson Parish				
		FIRST: 1968	59,485	21.5	0.80
		LAST: 1984	56,698	40.5	0.22
	New Orleans Parish				
		FIRST: 1960	90,104	58.3	1.00
		LAST: 1985	83,716	86.2	0.71
	Rapides Parish (Alexandria)				
		FIRST: 1968	28,443	34.0	0.96
		LAST: 1985	23,908	39.6	0.26
	Terrebonne Parish				
		FIRST: 1967	19,544	19.8	0.76
		LAST: 1984	20,799	30.7	0.31
Maryland	Baltimore				
		FIRST: 1968	192,171	65.1	0.82
		LAST: 1984	113,719	80.2	0.66
	Harford County				
		FIRST: 1964	20,658	7.6	0.68
		LAST: 1985	27,494	13.4	0.44
	Prince George's County				
		FIRST: 1968	146,976	15.2	0.66
		LAST: 1985	102,997	65.2	0.39
Massachusetts	Boston				
		FIRST: 1968	94,174	31.5	0.71
		LAST: 1985	59,539	72.6	0.36
	New Bedford				
		FIRST: 1968	15,866	14.8	0.39
		LAST: 1980	14,924	18.3	0.31
	Springfield				
		FIRST: 1968	31,700	23.6	0.46
		LAST: 1985	22,686	55.4	0.30
Michigan	Detroit				
		FIRST: 1968	296,097	60.7	0.75
		LAST: 1985	191,365	90.8	0.59

TABLE A2 (Continued)
Enrollment and Integration Levels During First and Last Periods

State	District	Year	Total Enrollment	Percent minority	Dissimilarity Index
Michigan	Grand Rapids				
		FIRST: 1965	32,724	18.4	0.79
		LAST: 1985	24,529	44.8	0.37
	Lansing				
		FIRST: 1967	31,756	14.6	0.45
		LAST: 1984	22,935	39.4	0.17
	Saginaw				
		FIRST: 1968	22,756	40.9	0.76
		LAST: 1985	16,241	66.8	0.70
Minnesota	Minneapolis				
		FIRST: 1968	70,006	10.7	0.58
		LAST: 1984	36,281	37.5	0.18
Missouri	Kansas City				
		FIRST: 1968	74,202	46.8	0.80
		LAST: 1985	36,451	73.6	0.52
	St. Louis				
		FIRST: 1968	115,582	63.8	0.88
		LAST: 1985	51,834	77.3	0.66
Nebraska	Omaha				
		FIRST: 1968	62,431	20.0	0.73
		LAST: 1985	41,533	32.0	0.29
Nevada	Clark County (Las Vegas)				
		FIRST: 1969	70,909	16.6	0.41
		LAST: 1984	87,506	25.5	0.27
New Jersey	Jersey City				
		FIRST: 1968	37,083	55.6	0.61
		LAST: 1984	30,166	83.7	0.53
	Newark				
		FIRST: 1968	75,960	81.9	0.75
		LAST: 1984	54,324	91.1	0.80
New Mexico	Albuquerque				
		FIRST: 1968	79,669	40.1	0.52
		LAST: 1985	77,222	45.5	0.45
	Las Cruces				
		FIRST: 1968	15,156	50.8	0.35
		LAST: 1980	15,378	56.3	0.22
New York	Buffalo				
		FIRST: 1968	72,115	39.1	0.67
		LAST: 1984	45,225	55.1	0.16
	New York				
		FIRST: 1968	1,063,787	56.1	0.66
		LAST: 1980	931,193	73.7	0.67

TABLE A2 (Continued)
Enrollment and Integration Levels During First and Last Periods

State	District	Year		Total Enrollment	Percent minority	Dissimilarity Index
New York	Rochester					
		FIRST:	1968	47,372	32.4	0.51
		LAST:	1985	32,348	67.3	0.35
	Yonkers					
		FIRST:	1967	30,768	15.4	0.51
		LAST:	1982	20,309	42.8	0.55
North Carolina	Cumberland County (Fayetteville)					
		FIRST:	1968	43,257	31.3	0.72
		LAST:	1985	43,485	45.0	0.22
	Gaston County (Gastonia)					
		FIRST:	1968	33,322	15.8	0.38
		LAST:	1985	31,769	17.9	0.30
	Mecklenburg County (Charlotte)					
		FIRST:	1967	79,686	22.5	1.00
		LAST:	1984	71,727	41.1	0.19
	New Hanover County (Wilmington)					
		FIRST:	1968	19,210	28.6	0.71
		LAST:	1985	19,318	30.3	0.14
Ohio	Akron					
		FIRST:	1968	58,589	26.0	0.63
		LAST:	1985	34,804	38.9	0.43
	Cincinnati					
		FIRST:	1968	86,807	43.3	0.66
		LAST:	1985	51,458	58.4	0.44
	Cleveland					
		FIRST:	1968	156,054	57.5	0.87
		LAST:	1985	76,362	74.6	0.20
	Columbus					
		FIRST:	1968	110,699	26.2	0.73
		LAST:	1984	66,696	45.5	0.14
	Dayton					
		FIRST:	1968	59,527	38.5	0.86
		LAST:	1984	29,603	60.7	0.19
	Lorain					
		FIRST:	1968	17,308	27.8	0.46
		LAST:	1985	12,228	46.2	0.24
	Toledo					
		FIRST:	1968	61,684	29.2	0.73
		LAST:	1985	43,291	41.4	0.47
Oklahoma	Lawton					
		FIRST:	1968	19,512	21.0	0.28
		LAST:	1985	18,224	35.0	0.14

TABLE A2 (Continued)
Enrollment and Integration Levels During First and Last Periods

State	District	Year		Total Enrollment	Percent minority	Dissimilarity Index
Oklahoma	Oklahoma City					
		FIRST:	1968	74,727	21.8	0.89
		LAST:	1982	41,761	46.9	0.23
	Tulsa					
		FIRST:	1968	79,990	17.0	0.65
		LAST:	1984	44,259	34.1	0.45
Oregon	Portland					
		FIRST:	1966	78,688	7.8	0.67
		LAST:	1984	48,807	27.2	0.37
Pennsylvania	Philadelphia					
		FIRST:	1968	281,711	61.4	0.75
		LAST:	1984	196,416	74.7	0.68
	Pittsburgh					
		FIRST:	1968	76,268	39.7	0.70
		LAST:	1985	39,777	52.0	0.35
South Carolina	Greenville County					
		FIRST:	1965	53,228	22.1	1.00
		LAST:	1985	50,900	26.7	0.24
	Richland County (Columbia)					
		FIRST:	1963	33,100	38.2	1.00
		LAST:	1985	27,627	73.0	0.47
South Carolina	Charleston County					
		FIRST:	1968	58,599	45.8	0.88
		LAST:	1985	41,748	55.7	0.48
Tennessee	Memphis					
		FIRST:	1968	150,661	49.2	0.95
		LAST:	1985	109,296	76.9	0.68
	Nashville					
		FIRST:	1968	93,720	24.2	0.81
		LAST:	1984	61,909	37.6	0.29
Texas	Amarillo					
		FIRST:	1968	29,821	12.5	0.61
		LAST:	1985	27,547	28.6	0.44
	Austin					
		FIRST:	1968	51,760	34.4	0.75
		LAST:	1984	57,476	49.5	0.27
	Dallas					
		FIRST:	1968	159,924	38.8	0.84
		LAST:	1985	130,815	78.2	0.55
	Ector County (Odessa)					
		FIRST:	1968	24,855	21.3	0.79
		LAST:	1985	26,518	43.3	0.23

TABLE A2 (Continued)
Enrollment and Integration Levels During First and Last Periods

State	District	Year		Total Enrollment	Percent minority	Dissimilarity Index
Texas	El Paso					
		FIRST:	1967	60,651	58.1	0.64
		LAST:	1985	61,098	76.4	0.46
	Fort Worth					
		FIRST:	1968	86,528	33.0	0.77
		LAST:	1984	64,289	60.2	0.50
	Houston					
		FIRST:	1968	246,098	46.7	0.80
		LAST:	1985	193,158	82.5	0.56
	Lubbock					
		FIRST:	1968	33,143	30.6	0.76
		LAST:	1984	28,457	45.9	0.51
	San Antonio					
		FIRST:	1968	79,353	73.1	0.67
		LAST:	1984	58,658	91.3	0.45
	Waco					
		FIRST:	1968	19,294	31.3	0.71
		LAST:	1985	13,640	64.3	0.21
Virginia	Arlington County					
		FIRST:	1968	25,934	14.1	0.50
		LAST:	1983	14,360	42.0	0.31
	Norfolk					
		FIRST:	1968	56,029	43.2	0.83
		LAST:	1984	35,782	62.9	0.17
Virginia	Pittsylvania County					
		FIRST:	1968	15,681	43.8	0.88
		LAST:	1985	11,863	39.2	0.22
	Roanoke					
		FIRST:	1967	19,344	24.4	0.80
		LAST:	1984	14,802	36.7	0.40
Washington	Seattle					
		FIRST:	1968	94,025	17.8	0.57
		LAST:	1985	43,535	50.6	0.17
	Tacoma					
		FIRST:	1967	36,825	12.0	0.50
		LAST:	1985	28,357	28.8	0.22
West Virginia	Raleigh County					
		FIRST:	1968	17,802	12.5	0.46
		LAST:	1984	17,382	9.3	0.57
Wisconsin	Milwaukee					
		FIRST:	1968	130,445	27.0	0.79
		LAST:	1984	86,878	62.0	0.31

TABLE A3

Implementation Years and Components of Desegregation Plans and Accompanying Change in Dissimilarity Index

State	District	Implementation Year	Plan Components	Change in Dissimilarity Index
Alabama	Birmingham	1970*	transfers/REZONING	-14.5
		1976	magnets/rezoning/pair	- 0.2
		1981	magnets/rezoning/pair	- 2.1
	Jefferson County	1967	freedom of choice	—
		1971-72*	transfers/REZONING	-32.5
		1975	rezoning	- 4.0*
	Mobile	1969	freedom of choice	-13.4
		1970	rezoning/pair	- 5.9
		1971*	REZONING	-16.9
		1975	rezoning	0.4
		1981	magnets/rezoning	0.4
Arizona	Mesa	No plan		
	Tucson	1978-80*	rezoning (MAJOR magnets/rezoning VOL)	- 5.3
		1980-83	magnets	- 1.6
Arkansas	Little Rock	1969	rezoning	- 5.1
		1970	pair	- 4.3
		1971	rezoning/PAIR	-32.8
		1972-73	rezoning/PAIR	-25.7
		1978	pair	- 7.4
		1982	magnets/neighborhood/ rezoning/pair	6.3
California	Compton	No plan		
	Fremont	No plan		
	Fresno	1978*	REZONING/PAIR	- 4.3
	Hayward	No plan		
	Long Beach	1980-83*	mags/trans (MAJOR VOL)	-15.0
	Los Angeles	1978*	MAGNETS/PAIR	- 5.2
		1980	magnets/pair	- 1.1
		1981-84*	magnets (MAJOR VOL)	2.8
	Modesto	No plan		
	Norwalk	No plan		
	Oakland	1964	freedom of choice	—
		1966*	transfers (OTHER VOL)	—
	Pasadena	1970*	rezoning/PAIR	-38.0
		1973	rezoning	0.3
		1983	magnets/transfers/ rezoning	- 0.4
	Richmond	1969*	mags/trans (OTHER VOL)	—

TABLE A3 (Continued)
Implementation Years and Components of Desegregation Plans and Accompanying Change in Dissimilarity Index

State	District	Implementation Year	Plan Components	Change in Dissimilarity Index
California	Sacramento	1964	rezoning	—
		1966	rezoning	—
		1968	magnets/rezoning	- 1.9
		1976*	magnets/REZONING/PAIR	- 3.3
		1979	magnets/rezoning/pair	1.1
	San Bernardino	1966	freedom of choice	—
		1973	transfers	1.1
		1978-81*	magnets (MAJOR VOL)	-12.4
	San Diego	1966	transfers	—
		1977-80*	mags/trans (MAJOR VOL)	-10.1
	San Francisco	1970	pair	- 1.0
		1971*	PAIR	-16.7
		1974	rezoning	- 0.2
		1978	magnets/rezoning/pair	6.8*
		1983	magnets/transfers	- 2.7**
	San Jose	1981-84*	magnets (OTHER VOL)	- 6.6
	San Lorenzo	No plan		
	Santa Clara	No plan		
	Vallejo	1967	rezoning	—
		1975*	REZONING	- 0.2*
Colorado	Denver	1969	transfers/rezoning	- 6.9
		1974	REZONING/PAIR	-13.1
		1976	REZONING/PAIR	-13.1
		1979	rezoning/pair	0.9
		1982	magnets/rezoning/pair	2.4
	Pueblo	No plan		
Connecticut	Hartford	1966*	transfers (OTHER VOL)	—
	Stamford	1962	rezoning	—
		1965-68	rezoning	—
		1970-72*	magnets/REZONING/PAIR	-35.9
Delaware	New Castle County	1976	transfers/rezoning	- 4.3
		1978*	rezoning/PAIR	-49.3
		1981	magnets/rezoning	- 2.8
Florida	Brevard County	1967	freedom of choice/ rezoning	—
		1969*	freedom of choice/ REZONING	- 7.9
	Broward County	1968	rezoning	- 1.1
		1970*	magnets/REZONING/PAIR	-28.9
	Dade County	1970*	REZONING/PAIR	- 7.7

TABLE A3 (Continued)
Implementation Years and Components of Desegregation Plans and Accompanying Change in Dissimilarity Index

State	District	Implementation Year	Plan Components	Change in Dissimilarity Index
Florida	Duval County	1967	transfers/neighborhood	
		1970	pair	- 8.1
		1971-72*	REZONING/PAIR	-40.5
		1981-84	magnets	- 0.7*
	Hillsborough County	1971*	REZONING/PAIR	-43.5**
	Lee County	1969*	REZONING	-53.1
	Orange County	1967	freedom of choice	—
		1968	freedom of choice/ rezoning	—
	Orange County	1970	transfers/rezoning	- 4.5
		1971	rezoning/pair	- 6.8
		1972-73*	REZONING	-12.4
		1978	rezoning	- 4.3
	Palm Beach County	1970-71*	transfers/REZONING/PAIR	-39.2
	Pinellas County	1969	rezoning/pair	- 5.8
		1970*	PAIR	- 7.5
	Polk County	1966	neighborhood/rezoning	—
		1967	freedom of choice	—
		1969*	REZONING/pair	-26.0
		1978	pair	- 1.5
	Volusia County	1969	REZONING	-27.1
		1970	REZONING/PAIR	-20.5
Georgia	Atlanta	1970	transfers	- 6.7
		1973*	transfers/REZONING/PAIR	- 4.8
	Dougherty County	1971	rezoning	-10.7
		1979	transfers/rezoning/pair	- 5.3
		1980*	REZONING/PAIR	-27.3
	Muscogee County	1971*	REZONING	-74.9
Illinois	Chicago	1975	magnets/rezoning	- 0.2
		1982-85*	magnets/transfers/ rezoning (MAJOR VOL)	- 4.5
	East St. Louis	No plan		
	Rockford	1973*	MAGNETS/transfers/ REZONING	- 6.0
		1977*	REZONING	- 6.1
Indiana	Fort Wayne	1971*	REZONING	-20.0
		1977	rezoning	- 6.5
		1979-82	magnets	- 7.3
	Gary	No plan		

TABLE A3 (Continued)
Implementation Years and Components of Desegregation Plans and Accompanying Change in Dissimilarity Index

State	District	Implementation Year	Plan Components	Change in Dissimilarity Index
Indiana	Indianapolis	1973*	REZONING/PAIR	-14.7
		1979-82	magnets	—
		1980	rezoning	-11.3*
		1981*	interdistrict rezoning (PAIR)	-16.4
	South Bend	1981*	magnets/REZONING/PAIR	-30.4
Kansas	Kansas City	1977-78*	MAGNETS/transfers/ REZONING	-14.5
		1980*	PAIR	- 3.3
	Wichita	1968	freedom of choice	- 2.6
		1969	transfers/rezoning	-11.6
		1971*	transfers/REZONING	-25.1
Kentucky	Fayette County	1972*	REZONING	-28.8
	Jefferson County	1975*	REZONING/PAIR	-51.0
Louisiana	Caddo Parish	1967-68	freedom of choice	—
		1969-70*	transfers/REZONING	-28.2
		1973	transfers/rezoning	- 5.5
		1981-82*	MAGNETS/REZONING	-11.7
	Calcasieu Parish	1969	REZONING	-16.4
		1970	REZONING	- 6.3
	E. Baton Rouge Par.	1967	freedom of choice	—
		1970*	transfers/REZONING	-17.0
		1981	magnets/REZONING/PAIR	—
		1982	magnets/REZONING/PAIR	-19.0
	Jefferson Parish	1969	neighborhood	-16.7
		1970	pair	- 7.2
		1971*	REZONING	-27.6
	New Orleans Parish	1961-63*	freedom of choice (OTHER VOL)	—
	Rapides Parish	1969*	neighborhood/REZONING	-27.0
		1970	rezoning/pair	1.6
		1975	magnets/rezoning/pair	- 7.1**
		1980*	REZONING/PAIR	-22.1*
	Terrebonne Parish	1966	freedom of choice	—
		1969*	REZONING/PAIR	-38.6
Maryland	Baltimore	1974	MAGNETS/rezoning/PAIR	- 6.3
		1975	rezoning	- 7.7
	Harford County	1965*	REZONING	—
	Prince George's Cty	1973*	rezoning/PAIR	-34.6

TABLE A3 (Continued)
Implementation Years and Components of Desegregation Plans and Accompanying Change in Dissimilarity Index

State	District	Implementation Year	Plan Components	Change in Dissimilarity Index
Massachusetts	Boston	1969	transfers	0.7
		1974 *	rezoning/PAIR	-19.8
		1975	MAGNETS/PAIR	-19.5
		1981	rezoning	0.6
	New Bedford	1976*	REZONING	1.6
		1981	rezoning	—
	Springfield	1968	transfers/rezoning	—
		1974*	PAIR	-17.7
		1976	magnets/rezoning	- 0.5
Michigan	Detroit	1971-74	magnets	- 2.4
		1975-76*	transfers/PAIR	-11.4
		1979	rezoning	0.1
		1981	rezoning	- 1.9
	Grand Rapids	1968*	transfers/REZONING	-13.3
		1980	magnets/rezoning	- 5.9*
	Lansing	1966	rezoning	—
		1972-73*	PAIR	- 8.0
		1976*	PAIR	- 3.5
	Saginaw	No plan		
Minnesota	Minneapolis	1972	rezoning	- 2.4
		1973	rezoning/pair	- 3.2
		1974 *	magnets/REZONING/PAIR	- 8.3
		1975	transfers/REZONING	- 2.4
		1982	magnets/transfers/ rezoning/pair	- 6.0
Missouri	Kansas City	1973	transfers	- 4.0
		1977*	magnets/REZONING/PAIR	-19.7*
	St. Louis	1976-78	magnets	- 8.1
		1980*	MAGNETS/transfers/ rezoning/PAIR	-11.6*
		1981	magnets/rezoning	—
		1982	magnets/rezoning	- 1.5*
		1984	magnets/rezoning	- 3.4**
Nebraska	Omaha	1976*	magnets/transfers/ REZONING/PAIR	-30.3
		1980	magnets/pair	0.6
		1983	magnets/rezoning	- 0.3
Nevada	Clark County	1972*	PAIR	-14.2
New Jersey	Jersey City	1976*	magnets/transfers/ rezoning (OTHER VOL)	- 1.8

TABLE A3 (Continued)
Implementation Years and Components of Desegregation Plans and Accompanying Change in Dissimilarity Index

State	District	Implementation Year	Plan Components	Change in Dissimilarity Index
New Jersey	Jersey City	1980*	mags/trans (OTHER VOL)	- 2.9
	Newark	1961*	transfers (OTHER VOL)	—
		1968	transfers/rezoning	—
New Mexico	Albuquerque	No plan		
	Las Cruces	No plan		
New York	Buffalo	1976-79	magnets/transfers/ rezoning (MAJOR VOL)	-31.1
		1980 *	MAGNETS/transfers/ rezoning	- 1.9
		1981	REZONING/PAIR	- 9.9
	New York	No plan		
	Rochester	1964-65	freedom of choice/ transfers	—
		1970-71*	PAIR	-11.1
		1980-83*	magnets (MAJOR VOL)	- 9.8*
	Yonkers	No plan		
North Carolina	Cumberland County	1969 *	REZONING/PAIR	-23.1
		1970	REZONING	- 6.4
		1972	rezoning	- 8.6
		1978	rezoning/pair	- 1.1*
	Gaston County	1969	rezoning/pair	- 3.8
		1970*	REZONING	-12.7
	Mecklenburg County	1968	freedom of choice/ rezoning	-27.4
		1969	rezoning	- 5.3
		1970*	REZONING/PAIR	-50.7
		1971	rezoning/pair	- 3.6
		1974	magnets/rezoning/pair	- 0.5
		1978	rezoning/pair	- 1.4
	New Hanover County	1969 *	REZONING/PAIR	-15.0
		1971	REZONING/PAIR	-45.6
		1976	rezoning	0.0
		1982	neighborhood/rezoning	- 3.1
Ohio	Akron	1977 *	REZONING	- 0.9
		1978	REZONING	- 3.2
		1979	REZONING	- 6.8
		1980	REZONING	- 8.0
	Cincinnati	1973-76*	magnets/transfers/ rezoning (MAJOR VOL)	-5.4
		1984	magnets/rezoning	- 2.5

TABLE A3 (Continued)
Implementation Years and Components of Desegregation Plans and Accompanying Change in Dissimilarity Index

State	District	Implementation Year	Plan Components	Change in Dissimilarity Index
Ohio	Cleveland	1979-80*	magnets/REZONING/PAIR	-65.4
	Columbus	1977	magnets/rezoning	- 1.8
		1979*	magnets/REZONING/PAIR	-38.0
	Dayton	1973	transfers/rezoning	- 3.8
		1975	magnets/transfers	- 3.3
		1976*	magnets/REZONING/PAIR	-46.4
		1982	rezoning/pair	- 5.2
	Lorain	No plan		
	Toledo	1970	transfers	- 1.9
		1980*	REZONING	- 5.8
Oklahoma	Lawton	1965	rezoning	—
		1968-71	magnets	—
		1973*	REZONING	- 6.3
	Oklahoma City	1967	transfers/pair	—
		1972*	REZONING/PAIR	-39.8
		1985	neighborhood	—
	Tulsa	1968	transfers/rezoning	—
		1969	rezoning/pair	0.0
		1971-72*	magnets/REZONING/PAIR	- 7.4
		1973-76	magnets	- 3.2
		1980	rezoning	- 2.1
Oregon	Portland	1964	transfers	—
		1974-76*	mags/res (MAJOR VOL)	- 4.8
Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	1978-81*	magnets (MAJOR VOL)	- 7.3
		1982-84	magnets/transfers	- 2.5
	Pittsburgh	1972	transfers	- 4.0**
		1980*	MAGNETS/REZONING/pair	-14.5*
		1982	magnets/rezoning	- 0.2*
South Carolina	Charleston County	1970*	REZONING	-16.8
	Greenville County	1970*	REZONING/PAIR	-63.6
		1976	rezoning/pair	1.1
	Richland County	1964	freedom of choice/ rezoning	—
		1970-71*	REZONING/PAIR	-52.1
Tennessee	Memphis	1972	rezoning/pair	- 2.5
		1973*	REZONING/PAIR	-32.1
	Nashville	1971*	REZONING/PAIR	-40.5
		1983	magnets/rezoning/pair	-11.8
Texas	Amarillo	1967	rezoning	—
		1968	rezoning	—

TABLE A3 (Continued)
Implementation Years and Components of Desegregation Plans and Accompanying Change in Dissimilarity Index

State	District	Implementation Year	Plan Components	Change in Dissimilarity Index
Texas	Amarillo	1970	rezoning/pair	- 2.0
		1972*	REZONING	-21.7
	Austin	1971	transfers/rezoning	- 8.3
		1973	pair	- 6.3
		1980*	PAIR	-19.9
		1983-84	magnets	1.2
	Dallas	1971*	transfers/REZONING/PAIR	-10.5
		1976*	magnets/REZONING/PAIR	-11.5
		1982	magnets/rezoning	- 1.2
		1984	magnets/rezoning	2.4
	Ector County	1982-84*	MAGNETS/REZONING	-24.5
	El Paso	1978*	transfers/REZONING	- 3.9
	Fort Worth	1971	transfers/rezoning/pair	- 8.5
		1973*	rezoning/PAIR	-18.2
		1983	magnets/rezoning/pair	4.7
	Houston	1967	freedom of choice	—
		1970 | *	transfers/neighborhood/	-4.2
		1971 |	transfers/REZONING/pair	-1.3
		1975-78*	mag/trans (MAJOR VOL)	- 4.4
	Lubbock	1970	rezoning	- 0.2
		1978*	MAGNETS/transfers/ rezoning/PAIR	-16.0
		1981	transfers/rezoning/pair	- 0.7
		1984	magnets/transfers/ rezoning	- 1.9
	San Antonio	1969*	REZONING	- 6.3
	Waco	1973*	neighborhood/REZONING/ PAIR	-34.5
		1984	magnets/rezoning/pair	0.6
Virginia	Arlington County	1971*	REZONING	-17.9
		1982	pair	- 0.9
	Norfolk	1969	rezoning	- 3.2
		1970 | *	REZONING/PAIR	-23.1
		1971 |	REZONING/PAIR	-42.1
	Pittsylvania County	1969-70*	REZONING	-65.9
		1977	rezoning	0.1
	Roanoke	1970-71*	transfers/REZONING	-56.9
Washington	Seattle	1977	magnets/transfers	- 6.2
		1978*	MAGNETS/rezoning/PAIR	-13.0
		1981	magnets/rezoning	- 5.7

TABLE A3 (Continued)
Implementation Years and Components of Desegregation Plans and Accompanying Change in Dissimilarity Index

State	District	Implementation Year	Plan Components	Change in Dissimilarity Index
Washington	Tacoma	1966	freedom of choice	—
		1967	transfers	—
		1968-71*	mag/res (MAJOR VOL)	-23.3
West Virginia	Raleigh County	1973*	REZONING	2.0
Wisconsin	Milwaukee	1976-78*	magnets/transfers/ rezoning (MAJOR VOL)	-35.2*

Note: The plan components are described in Section 3. "Transfers" refers to voluntary transfer programs, "neighborhood" means neighborhood attendance zones, and "pair" means pairing and clustering. Major components (see Section 5) are in capital letters.

An asterisk next to the implementation year denotes the major plan; for some districts, one or more contiguous plans are grouped together.

The change in the dissimilarity index is 100 times the difference between the level during the last year of implementation and the level during the year prior to implementation. For example, if a plan is implemented in 1971, it is the difference between the 1971 and 1970 levels; if a plan is implemented in 1974-76, the change is measured from 1973 to 1976.

* indicates that, due to missing data, the change was calculated from *two* years prior to implementation.

** indicates that the change was calculated from one year prior to implementation to one year *after*, again because of missing data.

— indicates that missing data precludes any of the above calculations.

TABLE A4
Classification of Districts and Major Plans

STATE	DISTRICT	IMPLEMENTATION YEARS	SCOPE	REGION
TYPE OF PLAN: PAIRING & CLUSTERING				
Large Urban Districts				
California	San Francisco	1971	partial	nonsouth
Indiana	Indianapolis	1981	full	nonsouth
Michigan	Detroit	1975-76	partial	nonsouth
Medium Urban Districts				
Kansas	Kansas City	1980	partial	nonsouth
New York	Rochester	1970-71	full	nonsouth
Texas	Austin	1980	full	south
	Fort Worth	1973	partial	south
Small Urban Districts				
Arkansas	Little Rock	1971-73	full	south
California	Pasadena	1970	full	nonsouth
Massachusetts	Springfield	1974	partial	nonsouth
Michigan	Lansing	1972-73	partial	nonsouth
	Lansing	1976	partial	nonsouth
Suburban Districts				
Indiana	Indianapolis Suburbs	1981	full	nonsouth
Maryland	Prince George's County	1973	full	south
Countywide Districts				
Delaware	New Castle County (Wilmington)	1978	full	south
Florida	Pinellas County (St. Petersburg)	1970	full	south
Nevada	Clark County (Las Vegas)	1972	partial	nonsouth
TYPE OF PLAN: REZONING WITH PAIRING & CLUSTERING				
Large Urban Districts				
Colorado	Denver	1974-76	full	nonsouth
Georgia	Atlanta	1973	partial	south
Indiana	Indianapolis	1973	partial	nonsouth
Minnesota	Minneapolis	1974-75	full	nonsouth
Missouri	Kansas City	1977	partial	nonsouth
Ohio	Cleveland	1979-80	full	nonsouth
Ohio	Columbus	1979	full	nonsouth

TABLE A4 (Continued)
Classification of Districts and Major Plans

STATE	DISTRICT	IMPLEMENT-ATION YEARS	SCOPE	REGION
Tennessee	Memphis	1973	partial	south
Texas	Dallas	1971	partial	south
	Dallas	1976	partial	south
Medium Urban Districts				
California	Fresno	1978	partial	nonsouth
	Sacramento	1976	partial	nonsouth
Nebraska	Omaha	1976	full	nonsouth
Ohio	Dayton	1976	full	nonsouth
Oklahoma	Oklahoma City	1972	full	south
	Tulsa	1971-72	partial	south
Small Urban Districts				
Connecticut	Stamford	1970-72	full	nonsouth
Indiana	South Bend	1981	full	nonsouth
Texas	Waco	1973	full	south
Countywide Districts				
Florida	Broward County (Ft. Lauderdale)	1970	full	south
	Dade County (Miami)	1970	partial	south
	Duval County (Jacksonville)	1971-72	full	south
	Hillsborough County (Tampa)	1971	full	south
	Palm Beach County (W. Palm Beach)	1970-71	partial	south
	Volusia County (Daytona Beach)	1969-70	full	south
Georgia	Dougherty County (Albany)	1980	full	south
Kentucky	Jefferson County (Louisville)	1975	full	south
Louisiana	East Baton Rouge Parish	1981-82	full	south
	Rapides Parish (Alexandria)	1980	full	south
North Carolina	Cumberland County (Fayetteville)	1969-70	full	south
	Mecklenburg County (Charlotte)	1970	full	south

93

TABLE A4 (Continued)
Classification of Districts and Major Plans

STATE	DISTRICT	IMPLEMENT-ATION YEARS	SCOPE	REGION
Rural Districts				
Louisiana	Terrebonne Parish	1969	full	south
TYPE OF PLAN: PAIRING & CLUSTERING WITH MAGNETS				
Large Urban Districts				
North Carolina	New Hanover County (Wilmington)	1969-71	full	south
South Carolina	Greenville County	1970	full	south
	Richland County (Columbia)	1970-71	partial	south
Tennessee	Nashville	1971	full	south
Virginia	Norfolk	1970-71	full	south
California	Los Angeles	1978	partial	nonsouth
Maryland	Baltimore	1974-75	partial	south
Massachusetts	Boston	1974-75	full	nonsouth
Missouri	St. Louis	1980	partial	nonsouth
New York	Buffalo	1980-81	full	nonsouth
Washington	Seattle	1978	full	nonsouth
Small Urban Districts				
Texas	Lubbock	1978	partial	south
TYPE OF PLAN: REZONING				
Large Urban Districts				
Texas	Houston	1970-71	partial	south
	San Antonio	1969	partial	south
Medium Urban Districts				
Alabama	Birmingham	1970	partial	south
Indiana	Fort Wayne	1971	full	nonsouth
Kansas	Wichita	1971	full	nonsouth
Michigan	Grand Rapids	1968	full	nonsouth
Ohio	Akron	1977-80	partial	nonsouth
	Toledo	1980	partial	nonsouth
Texas	El Paso	1978	partial	south

TABLE A4 (Continued)
Classification of Districts and Major Plans

STATE	DISTRICT	IMPLEMENT-ATION YEARS	SCOPE	REGION
Small Urban Districts				
California	Vallejo	1975	partial	nonsouth
Illinois	Rockford	1977	full	nonsouth
Massachusetts	New Bedford	1976	partial	nonsouth
Oklahoma	Lawton	1973	partial	south
Suburban Districts				
Alabama	Jefferson County	1971-72	partial	south
Maryland	Harford County	1965	partial	south
Virginia	Arlington County	1971	partial	south
Countywide Districts				
Alabama	Mobile	1971	partial	south
Florida	Brevard County (Melbourne)	1969	partial	south
	Lee County (Fort Myers)	1969	full	south
	Orange County (Orlando)	1972-73	partial	south
	Polk County (Lakeland)	1969	full	south
Georgia	Muscogee County (Columbus)	1971	full	south
Kentucky	Fayette County (Lexington)	1972	full	south
Louisiana	Caddo Parish (Shreveport)	1969-70	partial	south
	Calcasieu Parish (Lake Charles)	1969-70	partial	south
	East Baton Rouge Parish	1970	partial	south
	Rapides Parish (Alexandria)	1969	partial	south
North Carolina	Gaston County (Gastonia)	1970	partial	south
South Carolina	Charleston County	1970	partial	south
Texas	Amarillo	1972	partial	south
Virginia	Roanoke	1970-71	full	south
Rural Districts				
Louisiana	Jefferson Parish	1971	full	south
Virginia	Pittsylvania County	1969-70	full	south
West Virginia	Raleigh County	1973	partial	south
TYPE OF PLAN: REZONING WITH MAGNETS				
Large Urban Districts				
Pennsylvania	Pittsburgh	1980	full	nonsouth
Medium Urban Districts				
Kansas	Kansas City	1977-78	full	nonsouth
Small Urban Districts				
Illinois	Rockford	1973	partial	nonsouth

100

TABLE A4 (Continued)
Classification of Districts and Major Plans

STATE	DISTRICT	IMPLEMENT-ATION YEARS	SCOPE	REGION
Countywide Districts				
Louisiana	Caddo Parish (Shreveport)	1981-82	partial	south
Texas	Ector County (Odessa)	1982-84	full	south
TYPE OF PLAN: MAJOR VOLUNTARY				
Large Urban Districts				
California	Los Angeles	1981-84	partial	nonsouth
	San Diego	1977-80	full	nonsouth
Illinois	Chicago	1982-85	partial	nonsouth
New York	Buffalo	1976-79	partial	nonsouth
Ohio	Cincinnati	1973-76	partial	nonsouth
Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	1978-81	partial	nonsouth
Texas	Houston	1975-78	partial	south
Wisconsin	Milwaukee	1976-78	full	nonsouth
Medium Urban Districts				
Arizona	Tucson	1978-80	partial	nonsouth
California	Long Beach	1980-83	full	nonsouth
New York	Rochester	1980-83	partial	nonsouth
Oregon	Portland	1974-76	full	nonsouth
Small Urban Districts				
California	San Bernardino	1978-81	full	nonsouth
Washington	Tacoma	1968-71	full	nonsouth
TYPE OF PLAN: OTHER VOLUNTARY				
Large Urban Districts				
California	San Jose	1981-84	partial	nonsouth
Medium Urban Districts				
California	Oakland	1966	partial	nonsouth
New Jersey	Jersey City	1976	partial	nonsouth
Medium Urban Districts (Continued)				
New Jersey	Jersey City	1980	partial	nonsouth
	Newark	1961	partial	nonsouth
Small Urban Districts				
California	Richmond	1969	partial	nonsouth
Connecticut	Hartford	1966	partial	nonsouth

TABLE A4
Classification of Districts and Major Plans

STATE	DISTRICT	IMPLEMENTATION YEARS	SCOPE	REGION
TYPE OF PLAN: PAIRING & CLUSTERING				
Large Urban Districts				
California	San Francisco	1971	partial	nonsouth
Indiana	Indianapolis	1981	full	nonsouth
Michigan	Detroit	1975-76	partial	nonsouth
Medium Urban Districts				
Kansas	Kansas City	1980	partial	nonsouth
New York	Rochester	1970-71	full	nonsouth
Texas	Austin	1980	full	south
	Fort Worth	1973	partial	south
Small Urban Districts				
Arkansas	Little Rock	1971-73	full	south
California	Pasadena	1970	full	nonsouth
Massachusetts	Springfield	1974	partial	nonsouth
Michigan	Lansing	1972-73	partial	nonsouth
	Lansing	1976	partial	nonsouth
Suburban Districts				
Indiana	Indianapolis Suburbs	1981	full	nonsouth
Maryland	Prince George's County	1973	full	south
Countywide Districts				
Delaware	New Castle County (Wilmington)	1978	full	south
Florida	Pinellas County (St. Petersburg)	1970	full	south
Nevada	Clark County (Las Vegas)	1972	partial	nonsouth
TYPE OF PLAN: REZONING WITH PAIRING & CLUSTERING				
Large Urban Districts				
Colorado	Denver	1974-76	full	nonsouth
Georgia	Atlanta	1973	partial	south
Indiana	Indianapolis	1973	partial	nonsouth
Minnesota	Minneapolis	1974-75	full	nonsouth
Missouri	Kansas City	1977	partial	nonsouth
Ohio	Cleveland	1979-80	full	nonsouth
Ohio	Columbus	1979	full	nonsouth

Appendix B
Availability and Use of Data by Year

Table B1 lists the 125 districts in our sample, alphabetically by state. For each district, years for which enrollment data are *not* available are indicated with an X.

Table B2 is similar to Table B1, but the X refers to years for which it is not possible to calculate integration indices.

Table B3 indicates the sources of enrollment data. The legend following the table lists the sources.

TABLE B1
Enrollment Data Used

School District	Years Data Not Used																
	66	66	67	67	67	67	67	67	67	67	67	68	68	68	68	68	
	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85
ALABAMA																	
Birmingham																	X
Jefferson County (Excl. Birmingham)			X						X	X		X		X		X	
Mobile	X																
ARIZONA																	
Mesa	X								X	X				X			
Tucson	X			X													
ARKANSAS																	
Little Rock																	
CALIFORNIA																	
Compton	X	X	X						X	X		X				X	
Fremont	X		X														X
Fresno	X																
Hayward	X								X	X							X
Long Beach																	
Los Angeles	X																X
Modesto	X		X						X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
Norwalk-La Mirada	X								X		X		X			X	
Oakland		X		X		X			X					X			X
Pasadena																	
Richmond																	X
Sacramento																	X
San Bernardino																	
San Diego																	
San Francisco	X								X	X		X		X		X	X
San Jose	X								X	X							
San Lorenzo								X	X			X				X	X
Santa Clara									X	X							
Vallejo	X																
COLORADO																	
Denver																	
Pueblo	X													X			
CONNECTICUT																	
Hartford																	X
Stamford																	
DELAWARE																	
New Castle County (Wilmington)	X																X
FLORIDA																	
Brevard County (Melbourne)	X													X			X
Broward County (Ft. Lauderdale)																	X

TABLE B1 (Continued)
Enrollment Data Used

School District	Years Data Not Used																
	66	66	67	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	78	88	88	88	88	88	
	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85
FLORIDA (continued)																	
Dade County (Miami)	X							X		X		X					
Duval County (Jacksonville)								X		X		X		X		X	
Hillsborough County (Tampa)					X							X				X	X
Lee County (Fort Meyers)									X								X
Orange County (Orlando)	X											X					
Palm Beach County (West Palm Beach)	X											X					X
Pinellas County (St. Petersburg)	X				X												X
Polk County (Lakeland)	X																
Volusia County (Daytona Beach)	X																X
GEORGIA																	
Atlanta	X																
Dougherty County (Albany)																	
Muscogee County (Columbus)	X							X									
ILLINOIS																	
Chicago	X																
East St. Louis								X		X							
Rockford	X	X															
INDIANA																	
Fort Wayne	X																
Gary	X								X				X		X		X
Indianapolis	X							X		X		X					X
Indianapolis Suburbs	X	X	X	X	X	X	X										X
South Bend	X																
KANSAS																	
Kansas City	X																
Wichita																	X
KENTUCKY																	
Fayette County (Lexington)	X							X		X							
Jefferson County (Louisville)	X									X		X		X		X	
LOUISIANA																	
Caddo Parish (Shreveport)	X																
Calcasieu Parish (Lake Charles)																	
East Baton Rouge Parish	X							X		X		X	X		X		X
Jefferson Parish	X							X		X		X		X		X	
New Orleans Parish	X							X		X		X		X			
Rapides Parish (Alexandria)	X							X		X		X					
Terrebonne Parish								X		X		X		X		X	
MARYLAND																	
Baltimore	X																X

105

TABLE B1 (Continued)
Enrollment Data Used

School District	Years Data Not Used																
	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85
MARYLAND (continued)																			
Harford County (Baltimore)	X		X						X		X		X						
Prince George's County	X																		
MASSACHUSETTS																			
Boston	X												X					X	
New Bedford	X												X		X	X	X	X	X
Springfield	X																		
MICHIGAN																			
Detroit	X																		
Grand Rapids													X						
Lansing		X																	X
Saginaw	X																		
MINNESOTA																			
Minneapolis	X																		X
MISSOURI																			
Kansas City	X									X									
St. Louis	X												X		X			X	
NORTH CAROLINA																			
Cumberland County (Fayetteville)	X								X		X		X		X				
Gaston County (Gastonia)	X								X										
Mecklenburg County (Charlotte)																			X
New Hanover County (Wilmington)	X																		
NEBRASKA																			
Omaha	X																		
NEVADA																			
Clark County (Las Vegas)	X								X		X		X		X			X	
NEW JERSEY																			
Jersey City	X																		X
Newark	X																		X
NEW MEXICO																			
Albuquerque	X								X		X								
Las Cruces	X						X				X		X		X	X	X	X	X
NEW YORK																			
Buffalo	X																		X
New York	X								X		X		X		X	X	X	X	X
Rochester	X												X						
Yonkers									X	X							X	X	X
OHIO																			
Akron	X																		
Cincinnati	X																		

TABLE B1 (Continued)
Enrollment Data Used

School District	Years Data Not Used																	
	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85
OHIO (continued)																			
Cleveland	X																		
Columbus	X																		X
Dayton	X																		X
Lorrain	X																		
Toledo	X																		
OKLAHOMA																			
Lawton	X								X										
Oklahoma City	X								X		X		X		X		X	X	X
Tulsa	X																		X
OREGON																			
Portland																			X
PENNSYLVANIA																			
Philadelphia	X																		X
Pittsburgh	X					X							X		X				
SOUTH CAROLINA																			
Charleston	X								X		X							X	
Greenville County																			
Richland County (Columbia)	X										X								
TENNESSEE																			
Memphis	X																		
Nashville	X								X										X
TEXAS																			
Amarillo	X																		
Austin	X																		X
Dallas	X																		
El Paso																			
Fort Worth	X								X		X		X						X
Houston	X																		
Lubbock	X																		X
Odessa	X																		
San Antonio	X																		X
Waco	X																		
VIRGINIA																			
Arlington County	X																		X
Norfolk	X								X		X		X		X		X		X
Pittsylvania County (Chatham)	X																		
Roanoke											X				X				X

TABLE B1 (Continued)
Enrollment Data Used

School District	Years Data Not Used																	
	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85
WASHINGTON																			
Seattle	X								X										
Tacoma																			
WEST VIRGINIA																			
Raleigh County (Beckley)	X										X		X		X		X		X
WISCONSIN																			
Milwaukee	X								X						X				X

Note: Data Not Used means either it is not available to us or what is available is either incomplete, inconsistent with earlier years, or has some other feature that requires further clarification.

TABLE B2
Integration Data Used

School District	Years Data Not Used																	
	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85
ALABAMA																			
Birmingham																			X
Jefferson County (Excl. Birmingham)	X		X					X			X		X	X	X		X	X	
Mobile	X																		
ARIZONA																			
Mesa	X															X			
Tucson	X				X														
ARKANSAS																			
Little Rock																			
CALIFORNIA																			
Compton	X	X	X					X			X		X				X		
Fremont	X		X																X
Fresno	X																		
Hayward	X							X			X								X
Long Beach																			
Los Angeles	X																		X
Modesto	X		X					X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X		
Norwalk-La Mirada	X										X		X				X		
Oakland		X		X		X		X								X			X
Pasadena																			
Richmond	X	X	X																X
Sacramento																			X
San Bernardino																			
San Diego																			
San Francisco	X							X			X		X		X		X		X
San Jose	X							X			X								
San Lorenzo		X		X	X	X		X	X			X				X	X		
Santa Clara									X	X									
Vallejo	X							X											
COLORADO																			
Denver																			
Pueblo	X														X				
CONNECTICUT																			
Hartford																			X
Stamford																			
DELAWARE																			
New Castle County (Wilmington)	X																		X
FLORIDA																			
Brevard County (Melbourne)	X														X				X
Broward County (Ft. Lauderdale)																			X

TABLE B2 (Continued)
Integration Data Used

School District	Years Data Not Used																
	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85
FLORIDA (continued)																			
Dade County (Miami)	X			X				X		X	X								
Duval County (Jacksonville)	X							X		X	X		X		X		X		X
Hillsborough County (Tampa)				X									X				X		X
Lee County (Fort Meyers)										X									X
Orange County (Orlando)	X												X						
Palm Beach County (West Palm Beach)	X												X						X
Pinellas County (St. Petersburg)	X																		X
Polk County (Lakeland)	X																		
Volusia County (Daytona Beach)	X																		X
GEORGIA																			
Atlanta	X			X															
Dougherty County (Albany)																			
Muscogee County (Columbus)	X								X										
ILLINOIS																			
Chicago	X																		
East St. Louis	X			X					X		X								
Rockford	X	X																	
INDIANA																			
Fort Wayne	X																		
Gary	X									X				X		X		X	
Indianapolis	X								X		X		X						X
Indianapolis Suburbs	X	X	X	X	X	X	X												X
South Bend	X																		
KANSAS																			
Kansas City	X																		
Wichita																			X
KENTUCKY																			
Fayette County (Lexington)	X																		
Jefferson County (Louisville)	X									X		X		X		X		X	
LOUISIANA																			
Caddo Parish (Shreveport)	X																		
Calcasieu Parish (Lake Charles)																			
East Baton Rouge Parish	X								X		X		X	X		X		X	
Jefferson Parish	X								X		X		X						X
New Orleans Parish									X		X		X		X				
Rapides Parish (Alexandria)	X								X		X		X						
Terrebonne Parish								X	X		X		X		X		X		X
MARYLAND																			
Baltimore	X																		X

TABLE B2 (Continued)
Integration Data Used

School District	Years Data Not Used																	
	6 7	6 8	6 9	7 0	7 1	7 2	7 3	7 4	7 5	7 6	7 7	7 8	7 9	8 0	8 1	8 2	8 3	8 4	8 5
MARYLAND (continued)																			
Harford County (Baltimore)	X		X						X		X		X						
Prince George's County	X																		
MASSACHUSETTS																			
Boston	X																	X	
New Bedford	X												X		X	X	X	X	X
Springfield	X																		
MICHIGAN																			
Detroit	X																		
Grand Rapids													X						
Lansing		X																	X
Saginaw	X																		
MINNESOTA																			
Minneapolis	X																		X
MISSOURI																			
Kansas City	X									X									
St. Louis	X												X		X			X	
NORTH CAROLINA																			
Cumberland County (Fayetteville)	X								X		X		X		X		X		
Gaston County (Gastonia)	X								X										
Mecklenburg County (Charlotte)																			X
New Hanover County (Wilmington)	X																		
NEBRASKA																			
Omaha	X																		
NEVADA																			
Clark County (Las Vegas)	X								X		X		X		X		X		X
NEW JERSEY																			
Jersey City	X																		X
Newark	X																		X
NEW MEXICO																			
Albuquerque	X								X		X								
Las Cruces	X							X			X		X		X	X	X	X	X
NEW YORK																			
Buffalo	X																		X
New York	X								X	X		X		X		X	X	X	X
Rochester	X												X						
Yonkers									X	X							X	X	X
OHIO																			
Akron	X																		
Cincinnati	X																		

TABLE B2 (Continued)
Integration Data Used

School District	Years Data Not Used																
	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85
OHIO (continued)																			
Cleveland	X																		
Columbus	X																		X
Dayton	X																		X
Lorrain	X																		
Toledo	X																		
OKLAHOMA																			
Lawton	X								X										
Oklahoma City	X								X		X		X		X		X	X	X
Tulsa	X																		X
OREGON																			
Portland																			X
PENNSYLVANIA																			
Philadelphia	X																		X
Pittsburgh	X					X							X		X				
SOUTH CAROLINA																			
Charleston	X								X		X							X	
Greenville County																			
Richland County (Columbia)	X										X								
TENNESSEE																			
Memphis	X																		
Nashville	X								X										X
TEXAS																			
Amarillo	X																		
Austin	X																		X
Dallas	X																		
El Paso																			
Fort Worth	X								X		X		X						X
Houston	X																		
Lubbock	X																		X
Odessa	X																		
San Antonio	X																		X
Waco	X																		
VIRGINIA																			
Arlington County	X																	X	X
Norfolk	X								X		X		X		X		X		X
Pittsylvania County (Chatham)	X																		
Roanoke											X				X				X

TABLE B2 (Continued)
Integration Data Used

School District	Years Data Not Used																	
	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85
WASHINGTON																			
Seattle	X								X										
Tacoma																			
WEST VIRGINIA																			
Raleigh County (Beckley)	X										X		X		X		X		X
WISCONSIN																			
Milwaukee	X								X						X				X

Note: Data Not Used means either it is not available to us or what is available is either incomplete, inconsistent with earlier years, or has some other feature that requires further clarification.

TABLE B3
Availability and Use of Data

School District	Years of Data																										
	5	5	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	8	8	8	8	8
	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5
ALABAMA																											
Birmingham	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0	0	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	.
Jefferson County	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0	0	1	B	X	B	B	B	B	d	s	B	9	B	9	S	9	B	9	d	S
Mobile	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0	0	0	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
ARIZONA																											
Mesa	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	s	S	s	S	S	S	S	9	S	S	S
Tucson	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	S	S	S	X	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	B	S	
ARKANSAS																											
Little Rock	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
CALIFORNIA																											
Compton	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	9	X	X	S	S	S	S	S	.	S	.	S	.	S	S	S	.	S	S
Fremont	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	S	.	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	.	
Fresno	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	9	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Hayward	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	9	S	9	S	S	S	S	S	S	.	
Long Beach	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Los Angeles	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	.	
Modesto	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	S	.	S	S	S	S	S	.	.	.	.	.	S	.	.	S	S	
Norwalk	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	9	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	s	S	9	S	9	S	S	S	.	S	S
Oakland	.	.	.	.	.	.	S	S	S	S	S	X	S	X	S	X	S	S	9	S	S	S	S	S	X	S	S	.	
Pasadena	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	S	S	B	B	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Richmond	.	.	.	.	.	.	0	0	0	1	d	d	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	.	
Sacramento	.	.	.	.	.	0	0	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	.	
San Bernardino	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
San Diego	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
San Francisco	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	.	S	.	S	.	S	9	S	.	S	.
San Jose	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	9	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	.	S	.	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
San Lorenzo	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	S	e	S	e	e	e	e	S	.	.	1	S	.	S	S	S	.	.	S	S
Santa Clara	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	9	X	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Vallejo	.	.	.	.	.	.	0	.	.	.	.	S	S	S	S	S	S	d	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
COLORADO																											
Denver	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Pueblo	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	.	S	S	S	S
CONNECTICUT																											
Hartford	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0	0	0	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	.	
Stamford	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
DELAWARE																											
All Delaware	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	.	
FLORIDA																											
Brevard	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	S	S	S	B	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	.	S	S	S	.	
Broward	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	S	S	S	S	B	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	9

TABLE B3 (Continued)
Availability and Use of Data

School District	Years of Data
	55566666666 6 6 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 8 8 8 8 8
	78901234567 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5
FLORIDA (continued)	
Dade	. . . . . S S S d S S S 9 S 9 S 9 S S S S S
Duval	. . . . . 1 B B B B B B B 9 B 9 B 9 B 9 B 9 B 9
Hillsborough	. . . . . 1 S S S S X S S S S S S S S S 9 S S X 9
Lee	. . . . . 1 S S S B B S S S X S S S S S S S .
Orange	. . . . . S S S S S S S S S S S S S 9 S S S S
Palm Beach	. . . . . 0 0 0 S S S S S S S S S S S S . S S S .
Pinellas	. . . . . S S S s S S S S S S S S S S S S .
Polk	. . . . . S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S
Volusia	. . . . . S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S .
GEORGIA	
Atlanta	. . . . . S S S d S S S S S S S S S S S S S S
Dougherty	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 . . S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S
Muscogee	. . . . . 0 0 S S S B S S S . S S S S S S S S S S
ILLINOIS	
Chicago	. . . . . S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S
East St. Louis	. . . . . d S S e S S S S . S . S S S S S S S S
Rockford	. . . . . X S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S
INDIANA	
Fort Wayne	. . . . . S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S
Gary	. . . . . S S S S S S S S X S S S X S X S . S
Indianapolis	. . . . . S S S S S S S 9 S 9 S 9 S S S S S 9
Indianapolis Suburbs	. . . . . X . X . X . S S S S S S S S S S .
South Bend	. . . . . S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S
KANSAS	
Kansas City	. . . . . S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S
Wichita	. . . . . 0 0 0 S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S .
KENTUCKY	
Fayette County	. . . . . S S S S S S S s S s S S S S S S S
Louisville	. . . . . S S S S S S S S S . S . S . S . S .
LOUISIANA	
Caddo Parish	. . . . . S S S S S S S S S S S S S B S S S S
Calcasieu Parish	. . . . . 0 0 S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S
Baton Rouge Parish	. . . . . 0 0 0 . 0 X S S S S S S S . S . S . X S X S X S
Jefferson Parish	. . . . . 0 0 B B B B B B B 9 B 9 B 9 B S B S B .
New Orleans Parish	0 . 0 S S S S S S s S s S S S S S S S S 9 S 9 S 9 S 9 S S S S
Rapides Parish	. . . . . S S S S S S S S 9 S 9 S 9 S S S S S
Terrebonne Parish	. . . . . 0 0 0 S S S S S S e S X S 9 S 9 S 9 S 9 S 9
MARYLAND	
Baltimore	. . . . . S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S .

TABLE B3 (Continued)
Availability and Use of Data

School District	Years of Data 555666666666 677777 77 777 888888 789012345678 901234 56 789 012345
MARYLAND (continued)	
Harford	...0000SS..S.SSSSS.S.S. SSSSSS
Prince George's	.....S SSSSSS SS SSS SSSSSS
MASSACHUSETTS	
Boston	.....S SSSSSS SS SSs SSSS. S
New Bedford	.....S SSSSSS SS SS. S.....
Springfield	.....S SSSSSS SS SSS SSSSSS
MICHIGAN	
Detroit	.....9S SSSSSS SS SSS SSSSSS
Grand Rapids	.....SSSS SSSSSS SS SS9 SSSSSS
Lansing	.....SXSSSSSS SS SSS SSSSS.
Saginaw	.....S SSSSSS SS SSS SSSSSS
MINNESOTA	
Minneapolis	.....S SSSSSS SS SSS SSSSS.
MISSOURI	
Kansas	.....S SSSSSBS9 SSS SSSSSS
St. Louis	.....S SSSSSS SS SS. S. SS. S
NORTH CAROLINA Cumberland County	.....S SSSSSS.S.S9 S. S9SS
Gaston County	.....S SSSSSS 9S SSS SSSSSS
Mecklenburg County	.....1.SS SSSSSS SS SSS SSSSS.
New Hanover County	.....S SSSSSS SS SSS SSSSSS
NEBRASKA	
Omaha	.....S SSSSSS SS SSS SSSSSS
NEVADA	
Clark County	.....1 SSSSSS.B.S. S.S.S.
NEW JERSEY	
Jersey City	.....S SSSSSS SS SSS SSSSS.
Newark	.....S SSSSSS SS SSS SSSSS.
NEW MEXICO	
Albuquerque	.....S SSSSSS.B.SS SSSSSS
Las Cruces	.....S SSSS.S SS.S. S.....
NEW YORK	
Buffalo	.....S SSSSSS SS SSS SSSSS.
New York	.....S SSSSSd.B.S. S.....
Rochester	.....S SSSSSS SS SSXSSSSBS
Yonkers	.....SS SSSSSB9XSSS SSS...
OHIO	
Akron	.....S SSSSSS SS SSS SSSSSS
Cincinnati	.....S SSSSSS SS SSS SSSSSS

TABLE B3 (Continued)
Availability and Use of Data

School District	Years of Data
	55566666666666777777777888888
	78901234567890123456789012345
OHIO (continued)	
Cleveland	.....SSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSS
Columbus	.....SSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSS.
Dayton	.....SSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSS.
Lorrain	.....SSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSS
Toledo	.....SSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSS
OKLAHOMA	
Lawton	.....SSSSSSS.SSSSSSSSSSSSS
Oklahoma City	.....SSSSSSS9S9S9S9S99.
Tulsa	.....SSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSS.
OREGON	
Portland	.....00SSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSS.
PENNSYLVANIA	
Philadelphia	.....SSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSS.
Pittsburgh	.....SSSSXSSSSSSSXSXSSSSS
SOUTH CAROLINA	
Charleston	.....SSSSSSS.S.SSSSSS.S
Greenville	.....SSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSS
Richland County	..0000SS...SSSSSSSSSS9SSSSSSSS
TENNESSEE	
Memphis	.....SSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSS
Nashville	.....00SSSSSSS.SSSSSSSSS.
TEXAS	
Amarillo	.....0...9SSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSS
Austin	.....00SSSSSSSSSSSSSSSS.
Dallas	.....00SSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSS
El Paso	.....SSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSS
Fort Worth	.....00SSSSSSS9S9S.SSSSS9
Houston	.....000SSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSS
Lubbock	.....000SSSSSSSSSSSSSSSS.
Odessa	.....SSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSS
San Antonio	.....SSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSS.
Waco	.....SSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSS
VIRGINIA	
Arlington	.....SSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSd.
Norfolk	.....000SSSSSSS9S9S9S9S9S9
Pittsylvania	.....0000SSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSS
Roanoke	.....SSSSSSSSSS9SSS.SSS.

117

TABLE B3 (Continued)
Availability and Use of Data

School District	Years of Data
	57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85
WASHINGTON	
Seattle	. . . . . S S S S S S S . S S S S S S S S S
Tacoma	. . . . . 1 . 1 S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S
WEST VIRGINIA	
Raleigh County	. . . . . S S S S S S S S S . S . S . S . S .
WISCONSIN	
Milwaukee	. . . . . S S S S S S S . S S S S S 9 S S S .

Legend

Data Available for District Totals and Individual Schools

S	–	school data for enrollment	school data for integration
B	–	district data for enrollment	school data for integration
d	–	district data for enrollment	nothing for integration
s	–	nothing for enrollment	school data for integration
e	–	school data for enrollment	nothing for integration
X	–	nothing for enrollment	nothing for integration

Only District Totals Available

1	–	district data for enrollment	nothing for integration
0	–	nothing for enrollment	nothing for integration

Only School Data Available

S	–	school data for enrollment	school data for integration
s	–	nothing for enrollment	school data for integration
9	–	nothing for enrollment	nothing for integration

No Data Available

.	–	nothing for enrollment	nothing for integration

Appendix C
Bibliography for Desegregation Plans

The bibliography lists, alphabetically by state, those districts in the sample for which desegregation plan documents have been located. The documents are categorized as reported court opinions, unreported opinions, and other. Although this list is not exhaustive, it represents most of the documents which we consulted and should serve as a valuable reference.

BIRMINGHAM, AL

B. Unreported Opinions

Armstrong v. Board of Education of the City of Birmingham June 19, 1970.

Armstrong v. Board of Education of the City of Birmingham July 27, 1976.

Armstrong v. Board of Education of the City of Birmingham October 10, 1980. (Consent Decree)

United States v. Board of Education of the City of Birmingham May 8, 1967. (Corrected Decree)

United States v. Board of Education of the City of Birmingham 1970. (Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Final Judgment)

United States v. Board of Education of the City of Birmingham 1976. (Judgment)

United States v. Board of Education of the City of Birmingham 1980. (Consent Decree)

C. Other Documents

Bynum, Effie, et al., "Desegregation in Birmingham, Alabama: A Case Study." Bethesda, Maryland, 1974.

JEFFERSON COUNTY, AL

A. Reported Opinions

Stout v. Jefferson County Board of Education (Alabama) 380 F. 2d 385 (5th Cir. 1967); March 29, 1967.

Stout v. Jefferson County Board of Education (Alabama) #396 F. 2d 385 (5th Cir. 1968); June 3, 1968.

Stout v. Jefferson County Board of Education (Singleton v. Jackson Municipal Separate School District) 419 F. 2d 1211 (5th Cir. 1969); December 1, 1969.

Stout v. Jefferson County Board of Education (Alabama) #417 F. 2d 834 (5th Cir. 1969).

Stout v. Jefferson County Board of Education (Alabama) #425 F. 2d 1211 (5th Cir. 1970); January 21, 1970.

Stout v. United States (Jefferson County Board of Education and City of Pleasant Grove) 448 F. 2d 403 (5th Cir. 1971); July 6, 1971.

Stout v. Jefferson County Board of Education (Alabama) 466 F. 2d 1213 (5th Cir. 1972); September 7, 1972.

Stout v. Jefferson County Board of Education (Alabama)

483 F. 2d 84 (5th Cir. 1973); July 18, 1973.
Stout v. Jefferson County Board of Education (Alabama)
489 F. 2d 97 (5th Cir. 1974); January 25, 1974.
Stout v. Jefferson County Board of Education (Alabama)
537 F. 2d 800 (5th Cir. 1976); August 10, 1976.
Stout v. Jefferson County Board of Education (Alabama)
544 F. 2d 1342 (5th Cir. 1976); December 22, 1976.

B. Unreported Opinions
Stout v. Jefferson County Board of Education (Alabama)
September 8, 1971. (Plan)
Stout v. Jefferson County Board of Education (Alabama)
December 3, 1971.
Stout v. Jefferson County Board of Education (Alabama)
June 30, 1975.

MOBILE COUNTY (MOBILE), AL
A. Reported Opinions
Davis v. Board of School Commissioners of Mobile County
393 F. 2d 690 (5th Cir. 1968); March 12, 1968.
Davis v. Board of School Commissioners of Mobile County
393 F. 2d; April 26, 1968.
Davis v. Board of School Commissioners of Mobile County
414 F. 2d 609 (5th Cir. 1969); June 3, 1969.
Davis v. Board of School Commissioners of Mobile County
430 F. 2d 883 (5th Cir. 1970); June 8, 1970.
Davis v. Board of School Commissioners of Mobile County
402 U.S. 33, 91 S.Ct. 1289, 28 L.Ed. 2d 577 (1971); April 20, 1971.
Davis v. Board of School Commissioners of Mobile County
483 F. 2d 1017 (5th Cir. 1973); August 27, 1973.
Davis v. Board of School Commissioners of Mobile County
526 F. 2d 865 (5th Cir. 1976); Feb. 4, 1976.
Davis v. Board of School Commissioners of Mobile County
xxx F. Supp. xx (Ala. 1986); March 27, 1986.

B. Unreported Opinions
Davis v. Board of School Commissioners of Mobile County
April 20, 1971.
Davis v. Board of School Commissioners of Mobile County

July 9, 1971. (Order)

C. Other Documents

Board of School Commissioners of Mobile County, "A Comprehensive Plan for a Unitary School System," July 8, 1971.

Superintendent's Biracial Study Committee, "Report to Superintendent on the Review of the Implementation of the Comprehensive Plan for a Unitary School System," May 1, 1974.

Foley, A., "Mobile, Alabama: The Demise of State Sanctioned Resistance" in C. Willie and S. Greenblatt (Eds.), *Community Politics and Educational Change* (1981).

LITTLE ROCK, AR

A. Reported Opinions

Clark v. Board of Education of the Little Rock School District 426 F. 2d 1035 (8th Cir. 1970); May 13, 1970.

Clark v. Board of Education of the Little Rock School District 316 F. Supp. 1209 (E.D. Ark. 1970); September 24, 1970.

Clark v. Board of Education of the Little Rock School District 328 F. Supp. 1205 (E.D. Ark. 1971); July 16, 1971.

Clark v. Board of Education of the Little Rock School District 449 F. 2d 493 (8th Cir. 1971); September 10, 1971.

Clark v. Board of Education of the Little Rock School District 465 F. 2d 1044 (8th Cir. 1972); August 21, 1972.

Clark v. Board of Education of the Little Rock School District 705 F. 2d 265 (8th Cir. 1983); March 31, 1983.

B. Unreported Opinions

Zinnamon, et al. v. Board of Education of the Little Rock School District
July 22, 1971. (Decree)

C. Other Documents

Arkansas Gazette, "LR School Plan is Approved," June 23, 1972.

Arkansas Gazette, "Black-white Ratio For Grades 1–5 Presented to Board," April 27, 1973.

A Staff Report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, "School Desegregation in Little Rock, Arkansas," June 1977.

D. Related Cases

Little Rock School District v. Pulaski County Special School District No. 1 •

584 F. Supp. 328 (E.D. Ark. 1984); April 13, 1984.

Little Rock School District v. Pulaski County Special School District No. 1
597 F. Supp. 1220 (E.D. Ark. 1984); November 19, 1984.

Little Rock School District v. Pulaski County Special School District No. 1
xxx F. 2d xxx (8th Cir. 1985); November 7, 1985.

TUCSON, AZ

A. Reported Opinions

Mendoza v. Tucson School District Number 1
623 F. 2d 1338 (9th Cir. 1980); July 9, 1980.

Mendoza v. Tucson School District Number 1
625 F. 2d 834 (9th Cir. 1980); June 27, 1980.

FRESNO, CA

C. Other Documents

Fresno Unified School District Education Center, "School Desegregation in Fresno, California," August 1978.

LOS ANGELES, CA

A. Reported Opinions

Crawford v. Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles
17 C. 3d 280, 130 Cal Rptr. 724, 551 P. 2d 28 (1976); June 28, 1976.

Crawford v. Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles
113 C. 3d 643, 170 Cal Rptr. 495 (1980); December 19, 1980.

Los Angeles NAACP v. Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles
513 F. Supp. 717 (C.D. Ca. 1981); April 17, 1981.

Los Angeles NAACP v. Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles
650 F. 2d 1004 (9th Cir. 1981); June 23, 1981.

Los Angeles NAACP v. Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles
518 F. Supp. 1053 (C.D. Ca. 1981); July 16, 1981.

Crawford v. Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles
458 U.S. 527, 102 S.Ct. 3211, 73 L.Ed. 2d 948 (1982); June 30, 1982.

Los Angeles NAACP v. Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles
714 F. 2d 935 (9th Cir. 1983); September 1, 1983.
Los Angeles NAACP v. Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles
714 F. 2d 946 (9th Cir. 1984); September 1, 1984.
Los Angeles NAACP v. Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles
750 F. 2d 731 (9th Cir. 1984); December 1, 1984.

B. Unreported Opinions

Crawford v. Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles
February 7, 1978.
Crawford v. Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles
July 7, 1980.
Crawford v. Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles
August 6, 1980. (District Court of Appeal)
Crawford v. Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles
August 25, 1980.
Crawford v. Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles
September 10, 1981.

OAKLAND, CA

C. Other Documents

Kirp, David L., "Race, Schooling and Interest Politics: The Oakland Story," in *School Review*, (August 1979): 355–397.
Kirp, David L., "Oakland: Interest Politics Regnant," Chapter 10 in *Just Schools* (1982).

PASADENA, CA

A. Reported Opinions

Jackson v. Pasadena City School District
382 F. 2d 878 (1963); June 27, 1963.
Spangler v. Pasadena City Board of Education
#415 F. 2d 142 (9th Cir. 1969).
Spangler v. Pasadena City Board of Education
311 F. Supp. 501 (C.D. Cal. 1970); January 22, 1970.
Spangler v. Pasadena City Board of Education
#427 F. 2d 1352 (9th Cir. 1970).
Spangler v. Pasadena City Board of Education

375 F. Supp. 1304 (C.D. Cal. 1974); May 3, 1974.
Spangler v. Pasadena City Board of Education
384 F. Supp. 846 (C.D. Cal. 1974); August 12, 1974.
Spangler v. Pasadena City Board of Education
519 F. 2d 430 (9th Cir. 1975); May 5, 1975.
Spangler v. Pasadena City Board of Education
537 F. 2d 1031 (9th Cir. 1976); May 25, 1976.
Spangler v. Pasadena City Board of Education
427 U.S. 424, 49 L.Ed. 2d 599, 96 S.Ct. 2697 (1976); June 28,1976.
Spangler v. Pasadena City Board of Education
549 F. 2d 733 (9th Cir. 1977); January 24, 1977.
Spangler v. Pasadena City Board of Education
552 F. 2d 1326 (9th Cir. 1977); April 27, 1977.
Spangler v. Pasadena City Board of Education
611 F. 2d 1239 (9th Cir. 1979); June 6, 1979.
Spangler v. Pasadena City Board of Education
605 F. 2d 493 (9th Cir. 1979); September 20, 1979. (Mem. Dec.)

C. Other Documents

Pasadena Unified School District, "Plan for the Integration of the Pasadena Unified School District," March 1970.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Five Communities: Their Search for Equal Education*, (1972).

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *School Desegregation in Ten Communities*, (1973).

Wallenberg, Charles, *All Deliberate Speed: Segregation and Exclusion in California Schools*, 1855–1975. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.

"Integration Plan for the Pasadena Unified School District." (No Date)

RICHMOND, CA

C. Other Documents

Kirp, David L., Doris Fine and Sotirios Angelides, "Desegregation Politics and the Courts: Race and Schooling Policy in Richmond, California," in *American Journal of Education* 88 (November 1979): 32–82.

Kirp, David L., "Richmond: Busing, Backlash, and Beyond," (Ch. 7) in *Just Schools*, (1982). Richmond Unified School District, "The

Richmond Integration Plan." (No Date)

SACRAMENTO, CA

C. Other DocumentsBlubaugh, Ronald E., Letter of December 26, 1967. "School Desegregation Plan, 1966."

Holden, A., "Sacramento, California: Partial Desegregation in a Racially Imbalanced, Multiethnic School District," Part 3 in *The Bus Stops Here: A Study of School Desegregation in Three Cities* (1974).

SAN BERNARDINO, CA

A. Reported Opinions

NAACP v. San Bernardino City Unified School District 46 Cal.App. 3d 49, 119Cal.Rptr.784, 551 P.2d48 (1976); June 28,1976.

SAN DIEGO, CA

B. Unreported Opinions

Carlin v. Brd. of Educ. of the San Diego Unified School District 1977.

Carlin v. Brd. of Educ. of the San Diego Unified School District September 8, 1980.

C. Other Documents

Board of Education, San Diego Unified School District, "San Diego Plan for Racial Integration 1978–82," March 22, 1978.

Board of Education, San Diego Unified School District, "Evaluation of San Diego Plan for Racial Integration 1977–78," May 1978.

Board of Education, San Diego Unified School District, "Evaluation of San Diego Plan for Racial Integration 1978–79," June 1979.

Board of Education, San Diego Unified School District, "San Diego Plan for Racial Integration 1979–82 Revised," June 1979.

Board of Education, San Diego Unified School District, "Evaluation of San Diego Plan for Racial Integration 1979–80," June 1980.

Board of Education, San Diego Unified School District, "Amendments to San Diego Plan for Racial Integration 1979–82," June 24, 1980.

SAN FRANCISCO, CA

A. Reported Opinions

San Francisco Unified School District v. Johnson

#479 P. 2d 669 (Ca. Sp. Ct. 1971); January 26, 1971.

Johnson v. San Francisco Unified School District
339 F. Supp. 1315 (N.D. Ca. 1971); July 9, 1971.

Johnson v. San Francisco Unified School District
#339 F. Supp. 1332 (N.D. Ca. 1972).

Anderson v. San Francisco Unified School District
#357 F. Supp. 248 (N.D. Ca. 1972). (Administrative Demotion)

Johnson v. San Francisco Unified School District
500 F. 2d 349 (9th Cir. 1974); June 24, 1974.

San Francisco NAACP v. San Francisco Unified School District
484 F. Supp. 657 (N.D. Ca. 1979); September 18, 1979.

Johnson v. San Francisco Unified School District
576 F. Supp. 34 (N.D. Ca. 1983); May 20, 1983.

C. Other Documents

Kirp, D., "Multitudes in the Valley of Indecision: The Desegregation of San Francisco's Schools" in H. Kalodner and J. Fishman (Eds.), *The Limits of Justice* (1978).

Kirp, D., "San Francisco: Multitudes in the Valley of Indecision," Chapter 6 in *Just Schools* (1982).

SAN JOSE, CA

A. Reported Opinions

Diaz v. San Jose Unified School District
412 F. Supp. 310 (N.D. Ca. 1976); January 1, 1976.

Diaz v. San Jose Unified School District
612 F. 2d 411 (9th Cir. 1979); November 5, 1979.

Diaz v. San Jose Unified School District
518 F. Supp. 622 (N.D. Ca. 1981); July 15, 1981.

Diaz v. San Jose Unified School District
705 F. 2d 1129 (9th Cir. 1983); May 10, 1983.

Diaz v. San Jose Unified School District
733 F. 2d 660 (9th Cir. 1984); May 17, 1984.

Diaz v. San Jose Unified School District
xxx F. Supp. xxx (N.D. Ca. 1985); December 21, 1985. (Plan)

DENVER, CO

A. Reported Opinions

Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado
303 F. Supp. 279 (D. Co. 1969); July 31, 1969.

Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado
303 F. Supp. 289 (D. Co. 1969); August 14, 1969.
Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado
313 F. Supp. 61 (D. Co. 1970); March 21, 1970.
Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado
313 F. Supp. 90 (D. Co. 1970); May 21, 1970.
Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado
415 F. 2d 990 (10th Cir. 1971); June 11, 1971.
Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado
413 U.S. 189, 93 S.Ct. 2686, 37 L.Ed. 2d 548; June 21, 1973.
Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado
368 F. Supp. 207 (D. Co. 1973); December 11, 1973.
Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado
380 F. Supp. 673 (D. Co. 1974); April 24, 1974.
Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado
521 F. 2d 465 (10th Cir. 1975); August 11, 1975.
Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado
#439 F. Supp. 393 (D. Co. 1977).
Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado
#474 F. Supp. 1265 (D. Co. 1979).
Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado
540 F. Supp. 399 (D. Co. 1982); May 12, 1982.
Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado
576 F. Supp. 1503 (D. Co. 1983); December 30, 1983. (Bilingual)
Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado
609 F. Supp. 1491 (D. Co. 1985); June 3, 1985.

B. Unreported Opinions

Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado
June 3, 1974.
Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado
January 29, 1975.
Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado
March 26, 1976. (1976 Plan)
Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado
July 11, 1980.

C. Other Documents

Report obtained from Michael Jackson, General Counsel for the Denver Public Schools, "Historical Review of United States District Court Orders." (No Date)

Meadow, James, "Busing: It Has Been Five Long Hard Years," in Cervi's *Rocky Mountain Journal*, May 8, 1974, pp. 23–26.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, "Litigation and CommunityChange: The Desegregation of the Denver Public Schools," February 1976.

Denver Public Schools, "Adopted Plan for Implementing the United States District Court Order of March 26, 1976," April 1976.

Pearson, J. and J. Pearson, "Keyes v. School District No. 1," in H. Kalodner and J. Fishman (Eds.), *The Limits of Justice* (1978).

Wilkinson, J. Harvie III, *From Brown to Bakke: The Supreme Court and School Integration: 1954–1978.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

STAMFORD, CT

A. Reported Opinions

Moss v. Stamford Board of Education
350 F. Supp. 879 (D. Ct. 1972); November 14, 1972.

Moss v. Stamford Board of Education
356 F. Supp. 675 (D. Ct. 1973); March 26, 1973.

C. Other Documents

ommission on Civil Rights, *School Desegregation in Stamford, Connecticut* (1977).

NEW CASTLE COUNTY (WILMINGTON), DE

A. Reported Opinions

Evans v. Buchanan (New Castle Co.)
379 F. Supp. 1218 (D. De. 1974); July 12, 1974.

Evans v. Buchanan (New Castle Co.)
393 F. Supp. 428 (D. De. 1975); March 27, 1975.

Evans v. Buchanan (New Castle Co.)
416 F. Supp. 328 (D. De. 1976); May 19, 1976.

Evans v. Buchanan (New Castle Co.)
555 F. 2d 373 (3rd Cir. 1977); May 18, 1977.

Evans v. Buchanan (New Castle Co.)
435 F. Supp. 832 (D. De. 1977); August 5, 1977.

Evans v. Buchanan (New Castle Co.)
447 F. Supp. 982 (D. De. 1978); January 9, 1978.

Evans v. Buchanan (New Castle Co.)
447 F. Supp. 1041 (D. De. 1978); March 15, 1978.
Evans v. Buchanan (New Castle Co.)
455 F. Supp. 692 (D. De. 1978); May 5, 1978.
Evans v. Buchanan (New Castle Co.)
455 F. Supp. 705 (D. De. 1978); June 13, 1978.
Evans v. Buchanan (New Castle Co.)
455 F. Supp. 715 (D. De. 1978); June 22, 1978.
Evans v. Buchanan (New Castle Co.)
582 F. 2d 750 (3rd Cir. 1978); July 24, 1978.
Evans v. Buchanan (New Castle Co.)
465 F. Supp. 445 (D. De. 1979); January 19, 1979.
Evans v. Buchanan (New Castle Co.)
468 F. Supp. 944 (D. De. 1979); February 28, 1979.
Evans v. Buchanan (New Castle Co.)
512 F. Supp. 839 (D. De. 1981); April 10, 1981.

C. Other Documents

Raffel, J., *The Politics of School Desegregation: The Metropolitan Remedy in Delaware* (1980).

Wolters, R., *The Burden of Brown: Thirty Years of School Desegregation* (Part IV, 1984).

BREVARD COUNTY (MELBOURNE), FL

A. Reported Opinions

Weaver v. Board of Public Instruction of Brevard County, Florida
467 F. 2d 473 (5th Cir. 1972); September 6, 1972.

B. Unreported Opinions

Weaver v. Board of Public Instruction of Brevard County, Florida
April 28, 1967. (Corrected Decree)
Weaver v. Board of Public Instruction of Brevard County, Florida
#January 6, 1969.
Weaver v. Board of Public Instruction of Brevard County, Florida
#November 11, 1971.
Weaver v. Board of Public Instruction of Brevard County, Florida
#December 27, 1972.
Weaver v. Board of Public Instruction of Brevard County, Florida
#May 15, 1973.
Weaver v. Board of Public Instruction of Brevard County, Florida

#September 8, 1976. (Case dismissed)

BROWARD COUNTY (FORT LAUDERDALE), FL

A. Reported Opinions

Allen v. Board of Public Instruction of Broward County
312 F. Supp. 1127 (S.D. Fl. 1970); January 22, 1970.

Allen v. Board of Public Instruction of Broward County
432 F. 2d 360 (5th Cir. 1970); August 18, 1970.

Allen v. Board of Public Instruction of Broward County
329 F. Supp. 251 (S.D. Fl. 1971); June 21, 1971.

DADE COUNTY (MIAMI), FL

A. Reported Opinions

Pate v. Dade County School Board
303 F. Supp. 1068 (S.D. Fl. 1969); August 29, 1969.

Pate v. Dade County School Board
307 F. Supp. 1288 (S.D. Fl. 1969); December 10, 1969.

Pate v. Dade County School Board
#430 F. 2d 1175 (5th Cir. 1970); June 5, 1970.

Pate v. Dade County School Board
#315 F. Supp. 1161 (S.D. Fl. 1970); June 26, 1970.

Pate v. Dade County School Board
434 F. 2d 1151 (5th Cir. 1970); August 12, 1970. (Plan)

Pate v. Dade County School Board
447 F. 2d 150 (5th Cir. 1971); September 3, 1971.

Darville v. Dade County School Board
#351 F. Supp. 1249 (S.D. Fl. 1972); December 28, 1972.

Darville v. Dade County School Board
497 F. 2d 1002 (5th Cir. 1974); July 10, 1974.

Pate v. Dade County School Board
509 F. 2d 806 (5th Cir. 1975); February 28, 1975.

Pate v. Dade County School Board
588 F. 2d 501 (5th Cir. 1978); January 26, 1978.

DUVAL COUNTY (JACKSONVILLE), FL

A. Reported Opinions

Mims v. Duval County School Board
329 F. Supp. 123 (M.D. Fl. 1971); June 23, 1971. (Plan)

Mims v. Duval County School Board
447 F. 2d 1330 (5th Cir. 1971); August 16, 1971.

Mims v. Duval County School Board
385 F. Supp. 585 (M.D. Fl. 1974); June 24, 1974.
Mims v. Duval County School Board
784 F. 2d 1107 (11th Cir. 1986); March 20, 1986.

B. Unreported Opinions

Mims v. Duval County School Board
June 23, 1971. (Memorandum Opinion and Final Judgement)
Mims v. Duval County School Board
July 28, 1971. (Order)
Mims v. Duval County School Board
August 11, 1971. (Stipulation)
Mims v. Duval County School Board
August 23, 1971. (Stipulation)
Mims v. Duval County School Board
September 2, 1971. (Stipulation)
Mims v. Duval County School Board
September 2, 1971. (Order)
Mims v. Duval County School Board
November 11, 1971. (Order)
Mims v. Duval County School Board
February 28, 1973. (Order)
Mims v. Duval County School Board
February 29, 1973. (Order Approving Construction of Facility for Trainable Mentally Retarded)
Mims v. Duval County School Board
February 8, 1974. (Order)
Mims v. Duval County School Board
June 24, 1974. (Order)
Mims v. Duval County School Board
January 21, 1975. (Stipulation for Settlement as to Relocation of Career Education Center)
Mims v. Duval County School Board
March 10, 1975. (Order)
Mims v. Duval County School Board
March 31, 1975. (Stipulation for Settlement as to Location of Career Education Center, Westside)
Mims v. Duval County School Board

April 1, 1975. (Order as to Location of Career Education Center, Westside)

Mims v. Duval County School Board
February, 1977. (Stipulation for Settlement as to the Location of Vocational Skills Center, Northside)

Mims v. Duval County School Board
July 22, 1977. (Stipulation)

Mims v. Duval County School Board
August 4, 1977. (Stipulation)

Mims v. Duval County School Board
July 14, 1978. (Motion for Approval of Construction of Two New Elementary Schools Identified as Schools "G" and "H")

Mims v. Duval County School Board
August 28, 1978. (Order)

Mims v. Duval County School Board
November 22, 1978. (Order)

HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY (TAMPA), FL

A. Reported Opinions

Mannings v. Board of Public Instruction of Hillsborough County
306 F. Supp. 497 (M.D. Fl. 1969); August 18, 1969.

Mannings v. Board of Public Instruction of Hillsborough County
427 F. 2d 874 (5th Cir. 1974); May 11, 1974.

B. Unreported Opinions

Mannings v. Board of Public Instruction of Hillsborough County
#May 11, 1974.

C. Other Documents

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Five Communities: Their Search for Equal Education* (1972).

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *School Desegregation in Ten Communities* (1973).

LEE COUNTY (FORT MEYERS), FL

B. Unreported Opinions

Blalock v. Board of Public Instruction of Lee County
February 26, 1970.

ORANGE COUNTY (ORLANDO), FL

A. Reported Opinions

Ellis v. Board of Public Instruction of Orange County, Florida 421 F. 2d 134 (5th Cir. 1970); January 6, 1970.

Ellis v. Board of Public Instruction of Orange County, Florida 423 F. 2d 203 (5th Cir. 1970); February 17, 1970.

Ellis v. Board of Public Instruction of Orange County, Florida 465 F. 2d 878 (5th Cir. 1972); August 17, 1972.

B. Unreported Opinions

Ellis v. Board of Public Instruction of Orange County, Florida July 22, 1971.

Ellis v. Board of Public Instruction of Orange County, Florida September 17, 1971.

Ellis v. Board of Public Instruction of Orange County, Florida December 30, 1972. (Order)

Ellis v. Board of Public Instruction of Orange County, Florida January, 1976. (Motion for Modification of Order and Plan)

Ellis v. Board of Public Instruction of Orange County, Florida September 2, 1980. (Order)

C. Other Documents

McGrath, Cynthia, "Race and Education in Orange County, Flordia: The Process of Desegregation." Independent Study Paper, Florida Technological University. (No Date)

Memorandum Concerning Integration Progress in the Orange County School System, 1969.

Ney, Donald P., District Superintendent, Memorandum, November 13, 1972.

PALM BEACH COUNTY (WEST PALM BEACH), FL

A. Reported Opinions

Board of Public Instruction of Palm Beach County, Florida 413 F. 2d 1201 (5th Cir. 1969); June 3, 1969.

PINELLAS COUNTY (ST. PETERSBURG), FL

A. Reported Opinions

Bradley v. Board of Public Instruction of Pinellas County 431 F. 2d 1377 (5th Cir. 1970); July 28, 1970. (Plan)

Bradley v. Board of Public Instruction of Pinellas County 453 F. 2d 409 (5th Cir. 1971); December 30, 1971.

B. Unreported Opinions

Bradley v. Board of Public Instruction of Pinellas County
March 6, 1969. (Order)
Bradley v. Board of Public Instruction of Pinellas County
June 10, 1969. (Order)
Bradley v. Board of Public Instruction of Pinellas County
August 4, 1969. (Final Order)
Bradley v. Board of Public Instruction of Pinellas County
August 15, 1969. (Order)
Bradley v. Board of Public Instruction of Pinellas County
August 6, 1970. (Final Order) (Plan)
Bradley v. Board of Public Instruction of Pinellas County
February 17, 1971. (Order)
Bradley v. Board of Public Instruction of Pinellas County
April 15, 1971. (Order)
Bradley v. Board of Public Instruction of Pinellas County
May 15, 1971. (Order)
Bradley v. Board of Public Instruction of Pinellas County
July 23, 1971.
Bradley v. Board of Public Instruction of Pinellas County
November 9, 1971.
Bradley v. Board of Public Instruction of Pinellas County
September 5, 1972. (Order)
Bradley v. Board of Public Instruction of Pinellas County
November 27, 1976. (Stipulation)
Bradley v. Board of Public Instruction of Pinellas County
May 13, 1977. (Order of Amendment to Final Order andAmend-
ed Judgment)

POLK COUNTY (LAKELAND), FL

A. Reported Opinions

United States (Mills) v. Polk County Board of Public Instruction
395 F. 2d 66 (5th Cir. 1968); April 18, 1968.
Mills v. Polk County Board of Public Instruction
575 F. 2d 1146 (5th Cir. 1978); June 30, 1978.

B. Unreported Opinions

Mills v. Polk County Board of Public Instruction
May 10, 1967.
Mills v. Polk County Board of Public Instruction
July 2, 1968.

Mills v. Polk County Board of Public Instruction
November 14, 1968.
Mills v. Polk County Board of Public Instruction
March 20, 1969.
Mills v. Polk County Board of Public Instruction
May 9, 1969.
Mills v. Polk County Board of Public Instruction
August 6, 1970.

C. Other Documents

Report received from Polk County School District, "A Chronology of Desegregation of the Public Schools in Polk County, Florida, 1965–1978."

VOLUSIA COUNTY (DAYTONA BEACH), FL

A. Reported Opinions

Tillman v. Board of Public Instruction of Volusia County, Florida
430 F. 2d 309 (5th Cir. 1970); July 21, 1970.

B. Unreported Opinions

Tillman v. Board of Public Instruction of Volusia County, Florida
June 26, 1970. (Reported in 430 F. 2d 309 (1970), Supra)

C. Other Documents

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *The Diminishing Barrier: A Report on School Desegregation in Nine Communities* (December, 1972).

ATLANTA, GA

A. Reported Opinions

Calhoun v. Cook (Atlanta)
443 F. 2d 1174 (5th Cir. 1971); June 10, 1971.
Calhoun v. Cook (Atlanta)
332 F. Supp. 804 (N.D. Georgia 1971); July 28, 1971.
Calhoun v. Cook (Atlanta)
451 F. 2d 583 (5th Cir. 1971); October 21, 1971.
Calhoun v. Cook (Atlanta)
469 F. 2d 1067 (5th Cir. 1972); November 24, 1972.
Calhoun v. Cook (Atlanta)
362 F. Supp. 1249 (N.D. Georgia); April 4, 1973.
Calhoun v. Cook (Atlanta)

487 F. 2d 680 (5th Cir. 1973); August 21, 1973.

Calhoun v. Cook (Atlanta)
522 F. 2d 717 (5th Cir. 1975); October 23, 1975.

Calhoun v. Cook (Atlanta)
525 F. 2d 1203 (5th Cir. 1975); December 31, 1975.

C. Other Documents

"Analysis of Atlanta Compromise School Desegregation Plan." Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 013473, 1973.

West, Paul, et al., "School Desegregation in Metro Atlanta, 1954–1973." Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 013474, 1973.

Jackson, Barbara L., "Desegregation: Atlanta Style." in Theory Into Practice, School of Education, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1977.

Crim, A. and N. Emmons, "Desegregation in the Atlanta Public Schools: An Historical Overview," in C. Willie (Ed.), *School Desegregation Plans That Work* (1984).

DOUGHERTY COUNTY (ALBANY), GA

A. Reported Opinions

Gaines v. Dougherty County Board of Education, Georgia
392 F. 2d 669 (5th Cir. 1968); March 14, 1968.

Gaines v. Dougherty County Board of Education, Georgia
442 F. 2d 1344 (5th Cir. 1971); June 7, 1971.

Gaines v. Dougherty County Board of Education, Georgia
446 F. 2d 907 (5th Cir. 1971); August 25, 1971.

Gaines v. Dougherty County Board of Education, Georgia
465 F. 2d 363 (5th Cir. 1972); August 14, 1972.

Anderson (Gaines) v. Dougherty County Board of Education, Georgia
609 F. 2d 225 (5th Cir. 1980); January 7, 1980.

Anderson (Gaines) v. Dougherty County Board of Education, Georgia
489 F. Supp. 778 (M.D. Ga. 1980); May 2, 1980.

Anderson (Gaines) v. Dougherty County Board of Education, Georgia
586 F. Supp. 1324 (M.D. Ga. 1984); May 11, 1984.

MUSCOGEE COUNTY (COLUMBUS), GA

A. Reported Opinions

Lockett v. Board of Education of Muscogee County School District, Georgia
391 F. 2d 272 (5th Cir. 1968); March 15, 1968.

Lockett v. Board of Education of Muscogee County School District, Georgia
442 F. 2d 1336 (5th Cir. 1971); May 28, 1971.

Lockett v. Board of Education of Muscogee County School District, Georgia
447 F. 2d 472 (5th Cir. 1971); August 30, 1971.

CHICAGO, IL

A. Reported Opinions

Johnson v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago
604 F. 2d 504 (7th Cir. 1979); August 13, 1979.

United States v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago
544 F. Supp. 912 (N.D. Il. 1983); January 6, 1983.

United States v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago
567 F. Supp. 272 (N.D. Il. 1983); June 30, 1983.

United States v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago
567 F. Supp. 290 (N.D. Il. 1983); July 14, 1983.

United States v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago
717 F. 2d 378 (7th Cir. 1983); September 9, 1983.

United States v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago
588 F. Supp. 132 (N.D. Il. 1984); June 8, 1984.

United States v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago
592 F. Supp. 967 (N.D. Il. 1984); August 10, 1984.

United States v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago
102 F.R.D. 873 (1984); August 14, 1984.

United States v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago
744 F. 2d 1300 (7th Cir. 1984); September 26, 1984.

United States v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago
610 F. Supp. 695 (N.D. Il. 1985); May 23, 1985.

United States v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago
610 F. Supp. 702 (N.D. Il. 1985); June 4, 1985.

Samayoa v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago
783 F. 2d 102 (7th Cir. 1986); February 12, 1986.

C. Other Documents

Board of Education (City of Chicago), Comprehensive Student Assignment Plan (1982).

Board of Education (City of Chicago), Annual Desegregation Review, 1985–86.

ROCKFORD, IL

A. Reported Opinions

Quality Education for all Children v. School Board of School District #205 of Winnebago, IL (Rockford)
362 F. Supp. 985 (N.D. Ill. 1973); August 16, 1973.

Quality Education for all Children v. School Board of School District #205 of Winnebago, IL (Rockford)
385 F. Supp. 803 (N.D. Ill. 1974); June 27, 1974.

FORT WAYNE, IN

C. Other Documents

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Equal Opportunity in Fort Wayne Community Schools: A Continuing Struggle* (1977).

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Equal Opportunity in Fort Wayne Community Schools: A Reassessment* (1979).

U.S. Department of Education (Office of Civil Rights, Region V), Statement of Findings, February 23, 1984.

INDIANAPOLIS, IN

A. Reported Opinions

United States v. Board of School Commissioners of Indianapolis
332 F. Supp. 655 (S.D. In. 1971); August 18, 1971.

United States v. Board of School Commissioners of Indianapolis
474 F. 2d 81 (7th Cir. 1973); February 1, 1973.

United States v. Board of School Commissioners of Indianapolis
368 F. Supp. 1191 (S.D. In. 1973); July 20, 1973.

United States v. Board of School Commissioners of Indianapolis
503 F. 2d 68 (7th Cir. 1974); August 21, 1974.

United States v. Board of School Commissioners of Indianapolis
419 F. Supp. 180 (S.D. In. 1975); August 1, 1975.

United States v. Board of School Commissioners of Indianapolis
541 F. 2d 1211 (7th Cir. 1976); July 16, 1976.

United States v. Board of School Commissioners of Indianapolis
573 F. 2d 400 (7th Cir. 1978); February 14, 1978.

United States v. Board of School Commissioners of Indianapolis
456 F. Supp. 183 (S.D. In. 1978); July 11, 1978.
United States v. Board of School Commissioners of Indianapolis
506 F. Supp. 657 (S.D. In. 1979); April 24, 1979.
United States v. Board of School Commissioners of Indianapolis
637 F. 2d 1101 (7th Cir. 1980); April 25, 1980.
United States v. Board of School Commissioners of Indianapolis
677 F. 2d 1185 (7th Cir. 1982); March 26, 1982.

C. Other Documents

Indianapolis Public Schools, Interim Student Assignment Plan. September1973.

Planning Department, "Chronological Summary Court-Related Actions and Events I.P.S. Desegregation Case," September 9, 1980.

Marsh, W., "United States v. Board of School Commissioners" in H. Kalodner and J. Fishman (Eds.), *The Limits of Justice* (1978).

SOUTH BEND, IN

A. Reported Opinions

United States v. South Bend Community School Corporation
511 F. Supp. 1352 (N.D. In. 1981); April 17, 1981.
United States v. South Bend Community School Corporation
692 F. 2d 623 (7th Cir. 1982); October 14, 1982.

C. Other Documents

"Certified Copy of Resolution of Board of School Trustees of South Bend Community School Corporation," February 26, 1981.

KANSAS CITY, KS

A. Reported Opinions

Elrod v. United States
336 F. 2d 988 (5th Cir. 1964); October 12, 1964.
United States v. Unified School District No. 500, Kansas City (Wyandotte County) Kansas, et al.
610 F. 2d 688 (10th Cir. 1979); November 19, 1979.

B. Unreported Opinions

United States v. Unified School District No. 500, Kansas City (Wyandotte County) Kansas, et al.
February 14, 1977. (Memorandum and Order)

United States v. Unified School District No. 500, Kansas City (Wyandotte County) Kansas, et al.
June 8, 1977. (Memorandum and Order) (Plan)

United States v. Unified School District No. 500, Kansas City (Wyandotte County) Kansas, et al.
June 2, 1980. (Nunc Pro Tunc Order) (Plan)

United States v. Unified School District No. 500, Kansas City (Wyandotte County) Kansas, et al.
June 23, 1980. (Memorandum and Order)

United States v. Unified School District No. 500, Kansas City (Wyandotte County) Kansas, et al.
July 3, 1980. (Memorandum and Order)

United States v. Unified School District No. 500, Kansas City (Wyandotte County) Kansas, et al.
March 18, 1981. (Memorandum and Order)

WICHITA, KS

A. Reported Opinions

Linker v. Unified School District #259, Wichita, Kansas, et al.
344 F. Supp 1187 (D. Ks. 1972); June 27, 1972. (Plan)

B. Other Documents

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *School Desegregation in Wichita, Kansas* (1977).

FAYETTE COUNTY (LEXINGTON), KY

A. Reported Opinions

Jefferson v. Board of Education of Fayette County
344 F. Supp. 688 (E.D. Ky. 1972); June 13, 1972.

Jefferson v. Board of Education of Fayette County
486 F. 2d 1405 (6th Cir. 1973).

Joslin (Jefferson) v. Board of Education of Fayette County
585 F. Supp. 37 (E.D. Ky. 1983); July 22, 1983.

JEFFERSON COUNTY (LOUISVILLE), KY

A. Reported Opinions

Newburg Area Council, Inc. v. Board of Education of Jefferson County, Kentucky
489 F. 2d 925 (6th Cir. 1973); December 28, 1973.

Newburg Area Council, Inc. v. Board of Education of Jefferson County, Kentucky

510 F. 2d 1358 (6th Cir. 1974); December 11, 1974.

Newburg Area Council, Inc. v. Gordon (Board of Education of Jefferson County, Kentucky)
521 F. 2d 578 (6th Cir. 1975); July 17, 1975.

Stout v. Jefferson County Board of Education
537 F. 2d 800 (5th Cir. 1976); August 10, 1976.

Cunningham v. Grayson (Board of Education of Jefferson County, Kentucky)
541 F. 2d 538 (6th Cir. 1976); August 23, 1976.

Haycraft v. Board of Education of Jefferson County, Kentucky
560 F. 2d 755 (6th Cir. 1977); August 23, 1977.

Newburg Area Council v. Board of Education of Jefferson County
583 F. 2d 827 (6th Cir. 1978); August 14, 1978.

Haycraft v. Board of Education of Jefferson County, Kentucky
585 F. 2d 803 (6th Cir. 1974); October 20, 1978.

B. Unreported Opinions

Haycraft v. Board of Education of Jefferson County, Kentucky
#January 30, 1975. (Memorandum Opinion and Order)

Newburg Area Council, Inc. v. Board of Education of Jefferson County, Kentucky
#July 30, 1975. (Order) (Plan)

Haycraft v. Board of Education of Jefferson County, Kentucky
April 1, 1976. (Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law)

Newburg Area Council, Inc. v. Board of Education of Jefferson
#August 2, 1976.

C. Other Documents

Commission on Human Rights, Commonwealth of Kentucky, "Louisville School System Retreats to Segregation (A Report on Public Schools in Louisville, Kentucky 1956–1971)," (1972).

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *School Desegregation in Louisville and Jefferson County* (1977).

CADDO PARISH (SHREVEPORT), LA

A. Reported Opinions

Jones v. Caddo Parish School Board
#293 F. Supp. 84.

Jones v. Caddo Parish School Board (Hall v. St. Helena Parish School Board)

417 F. 2d 801 (5th Cir. 1969); May 28, 1969.

Jones v. Caddo Parish School Board (Conley v. Lake Charles School Board)
303 F. Supp. 394 (W.D. La. 1969); June 9, 1969.

Jones v. Caddo Parish School Board
421 F. 2d 313 (5th Cir. 1970); January 6, 1970.

Jones v. Caddo Parish School Board
487 F. 2d 1275 (5th Cir. 1973); October 31, 1973.

Jones v. Caddo Parish School Board
499 F. 2d 914 (5th Cir. 1974); August 30, 1974.

Jones v. Caddo Parish School Board
704 F. 2d 206 (5th Cir. 1983); May 6, 1983.

Jones v. Caddo Parish School Board
718 F. 2d 120 (5th Cir. 1983); September 28, 1983.

Jones v. Caddo Parish School Board
735 F. 2d 923 (5th Cir. 1984); July 9, 1984.

B. Unreported Opinions

Jones v. Caddo Parish School Board
July 5, 1969.

Jones v. Caddo Parish School Board
July 21, 1969.

Jones v. Caddo Parish School Board
#August 1, 1969. (Modified August 4)

Jones v. Caddo Parish School Board
June 1, 1973.

Jones v. Caddo Parish School Board
#July 20, 1973.

Jones v. Caddo Parish School Board
#December 30, 1977. (Unitary)

Jones v. Caddo Parish School Board
May 5, 1981. (Plan)

C. Other Documents

Court Appointed Citizens Committee, Desegregation Plan (1972).

CALCASIEU PARISH (LAKE CHARLES), LA

A. Reported Opinions

Conley v. Lake Charles School Board
#293 F. Supp. 84 (W.D. La. 1968); November 14, 1968.

Conley v. Lake Charles School Board
303 F. Supp. 394 (W.D. La. 1969); June 5, 1969.
Conley v. Lake Charles School Board
314 F. Supp. 1282 (W.D. La. 1970); June 11, 1970.
Conley v. Lake Charles School Board
434 F. 2d 35 (5th Cir. 1970); August 25, 1970.

B. Unreported Opinions
Conley v. Lake Charles School Board
June 11, 1970.
Conley v. Lake Charles School Board
August 25, 1970.

EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA

A. Reported Opinions
Davis v. East Baton Rouge Parish School Board
398 F. Supp 1013 (M.D. La. 1975); August 21, 1975.
Davis v. East Baton Rouge Parish School Board
570 F. 2d 1260 (5th Cir. 1978); April 7, 1978.
Davis v. East Baton Rouge Parish School Board
498 F. Supp 580 (M.D. La. 1980); September 11, 1980.
Davis v. East Baton Rouge Parish School Board
514 F. Supp 869 (M.D. La. 1981); May 1, 1981.
Davis v. East Baton Rouge Parish School Board
533 F. Supp 1161 (M.D. La. 1982); March 8, 1982.
Davis v. East Baton Rouge Parish School Board
541 F. Supp 1048 (M.D. La. 1982); May 7, 1982.
Davis v. East Baton Rouge Parish School Board
721 F. 2d 1425 (5th Cir. 1983); December 15, 1983.

B. Unreported Opinions
Davis v. East Baton Rouge Parish School Board
May 8, 1967. (Corrected Decree)
Davis v. East Baton Rouge Parish School Board
July 23, 1970. (Memorandum Opinion and Order)

JEFFERSON PARISH, LA

A. Reported Opinions
Dandridge v. Jefferson Parish School Board (Hall v. St. Helena Parish School Board)
417 F. 2d 801 (5th Cir. 1969); June 30, 1969.

Gordon (Dandridge) v. Jefferson Parish School Board
315 F. Supp. 901 (W.D. La. 1970); June 8, 1970.
Gordon (Dandridge) v. Jefferson Parish School Board
446 F. 2d 266 (5th Cir. 1971); June 28, 1971.
Dandridge v. Jefferson Parish School Board
332 F. Supp. 590 (W.D. La. 1971); August 10, 1971.
Dandridge v. Jefferson Parish School Board
456 F. 2d 552 (5th Cir. 1972); February 11, 1972.

RAPIDES PARISH (ALEXANDRIA), LA

A. Reported Opinions

Valley v. Rapides Parish School Board (Conley v. Lake Charles School Board)
303 F. Supp. 394 (W.D. La. 1969); June 5, 1969.
Valley v. Rapides Parish School Board
422 F. 2d 814 (5th Cir. 1970); January 7, 1970.
Valley v. Rapides Parish School Board
423 F. 2d 1132 (5th Cir. 1970); March 6, 1970.
Valley v. Rapides Parish School Board
313 F. Supp. 1193 (W.D. La. 1970); June 5, 1970. (Plan)
Valley v. Rapides Parish School Board
434 F. 2d 144 (5th Cir. 1970); August 25, 1970. (Plan)
Hinds (Valley) v. Rapides Parish School Board
479 F. 2d 762 (5th Cir. 1973); May 8, 1973.
Valley v. Rapides Parish School Board
499 F. Supp. 490 (W.D. La. 1980); August 6, 1980. (Plan)
Valley v. Rapides Parish School Board
646 F. 2d 925 (5th Cir. 1981); May 18, 1981.
Valley v. Rapides Parish School Board
653 F. 2d 941 (5th Cir. 1981); August 14, 1981.
Valley v. Rapides Parish School Board
702 F. 2d 1221 (5th Cir. 1983); May 30, 1983.
Valley v. Rapides Parish School Board
705 F. 2d 112 (5th Cir. 1983); April 29, 1983.

B. Unreported Opinions

Valley v. Rapides Parish School Board
#July 24, 1969.
Valley v. Rapides Parish School Board
May 7, 1975.

Valley v. Rapides Parish School Board
July 3, 1980. (Modified, 499 F. Supp. 490 (1980))
Valley v. Rapides Parish School Board
August 6, 1980. (Final Judgment)
Valley v. Rapides Parish School Board
August 20, 1980. (Second Amendment to Final Judgment)
Valley v. Rapides Parish School Board
August 29, 1980. (Third Amendment to Final Judgment)
Valley v. Rapides Parish School Board
September 3, 1980. (Fourth Amendment to Final Judgment)
Valley v. Rapides Parish School Board
May 1, 1981. (Fifth Amendment to Final Judgment)

BOSTON, MA

A. Reported Opinions

School Committee of Boston v. Board of Education
#363 Ma. 20 (1973).
School Committee of Boston v. Board of Education
#363 Ma. 125 (1973).
School Committee of Boston v. Board of Education
#364 Ma. 199 (1973).
Morgan v. Hennegan (Boston School Committee)
#379 F. Supp. 410 (D. Ma. 1974); June 21, 1974.
Morgan v. Kerrigan (Boston School Committee)
#509 F. 2d 580 (1st Cir. 1974); June 21, 1974.
Morgan v. Kerrigan (Boston School Committee)
#509 F. 2d 618 (1st Cir. 1975); January 7, 1975.
Morgan v. Kerrigan (Boston School Committee)
#509 F. 2d 599 (1st Cir. 1975); January 28, 1975.
Morgan v. Kerrigan (Boston School Committee)
#388 F. Supp. 581 (D. Ma. 1975); January 28, 1975.
Morgan v. Kerrigan (Boston School Committee)
401 F. Supp. 270 (D. Ma. 1975); May 28, 1975.
Morgan v. Kerrigan (Boston School Committee)
401 F. Supp. 216 (D. Ma. 1975); June 5, 1975. (Plan)
Morgan v. Kerrigan (Boston School Committee)
#523 F. 2d 917 (1st Cir. 1975); June 17, 1975.
Morgan v. Kerrigan (Boston School Committee)
#409 F. Supp. 1141 (D. Ma. 1975); December 16, 1975.

Morgan v. Kerrigan (Boston School Committee)
#530 F. 2d 401 (1st Cir. 1976); January 14, 1976.
Morgan v. Kerrigan (Boston School Committee)
#530 F. 2d 431 (1st Cir. 1976); January 26, 1976.
Morgan v. Kerrigan (Boston School Committee)
#540 F. 2d 527 (1st Cir. 1976).
Morgan v. Kerrigan (Boston School Committee)
#548 F. 2d 28 (1st Cir. 1977).
Morgan v. O'Bryant (Boston School Committee)
671 F. 2d 23 (1st Cir. 1982); February 17, 1982.
Morgan v. O'Bryant (Boston School Committee)
687 F. 2d 510 (1st Cir. 1982); August 27, 1982.
Morgan v. McDonough (Boston School Committee)
689 F. 2d 265 (1st Cir. 1982); September 16, 1982.
Morgan v. McDonough (Boston School Committee)
#554 F. Supp. 169 (D. Ma. 1982).
Morgan v. McDonough (Boston School Committee)
726 F. 2d 11 (1st Cir. 1984); January 30, 1984.
Morgan v. McKeigue (Boston School Committee)
729 F. 2d 33 (1st Cir. 1984); February 2, 1984.
Morgan v. Nucci (Boston School Committee)
602 F. Supp. 806 (D. Ma. 1985); February 20, 1985.
Morgan v. Nucci (Boston School Committee)
612 F. Supp. 1060 (D. Ma. 1985); July 5, 1985.

C. Other Documents

Smith, R., "Two Centuries and Twenty-four Months: A Chronicle of the Struggle to Desegregate the Boston Public Schools," in H. Kalodner and J. Fishman (Eds.), *The Limits of Justice* (1978).

Denter, R. and M. Scott, *Schools on Trial: An Inside Account of the Boston School Desegregation Case* (1981).

Dentler, R., "The Boston School Desegregation Plan," in C. Willie (Ed.), *School Desegregation Plans That Work* (1984).

SPRINGFIELD, MA

A. Reported Opinions

Barksdale v. School Committee of Springfield
#273 F. Supp. 543 (D. Ma. 1965).
Barksdale v. School Committee of Springfield
#348 F. 2d 132 (1st Cir. 1965).

School Committee of Springfield v. Board of Education #362 Ma. 417 (1972).

School Committee of Springfield v. Board of Education #365 Ma. 215 (1974).

School Committee of Springfield v. Board of Education #366 Ma. 315 (1974); November 12, 1974.

C. Other Documents

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *School Desegregation in Springfield, Massachusetts*, (1977).

BALTIMORE, MD

B. Unreported Opinions

Starr v. Parks
June 2, 1972. (Facts)

C. Other Documents

Baltimore City Public Schools, "Junior High School Desegregation Plan for Baltimore City Public Schools 1975." Submitted to Office of Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1975.

Baltimore City Public Schools, "Senior High School Desegregation Plan for Baltimore City Public Schools 1975." Submitted to Office of Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1975.

Smith, Catherine Pope, "A Study of the Influence Exerted by Selected Influentials on the Desegregation Plan Formulated by Baltimore City in 1974–75." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1976.

Baltimore City Public Schools, "Desegregation Efforts Undertaken by the Baltimore City Public Schools, Chronology of Events, February 16, 1973 to Present," November 17, 1978.

Baltimore City Public Schools, "Desegregation Plans....A Current Status Summary." Center for Planning, Research, and Evaluation, May 1979.

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MD

A. Reported Opinions

Vaughns v. Board of Education of Prince George's County #355 F. Supp. 1034 (D. Md. 1972); July 25, 1972.

Vaughns v. Board of Education of Prince George's County #355 F. Supp. 1038 (D. Md. 1972); August 31, 1972.

Vaughns v. Board of Education of Prince George's County 468 F. 2d 894 (4th Cir. 1972); October 12, 1972.

Vaughns v. Board of Education of Prince George's County 355 F. Supp. 1044 (D. Md. 1972); December 13, 1972.

Vaughns v. Board of Education of Prince George's County 355 F. Supp. 1051 (D. Md. 1972); December 29, 1972.

Vaughns v. Board of Education of Prince George's County 574 F. Supp. 1280 (D. Md. 1983); June 20, 1983.

Vaughns v. Board of Education of Prince George's County 598 F. Supp. 1262 (D. Md. 1984); November 9, 1984.

Vaughns v. Board of Education of Prince George's County 758 F. 2d 983 (4th Cir. 1985); March 28, 1985.

B. Unreported Opinions

Vaughns v. Board of Education of Prince George's County December 29, 1972.

Vaughns v. Board of Education of Prince George's County June 30, 1985.

C. Other Documents

"Introduction to Prince George's County Desegregation Plan," December 20, 1972.

Board of Education of Prince George's County, "DesegregationPlan."

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *A Long Day's Journey into Light: School Desegregation in Prince George's County.*

DETROIT, MI

A. Reported Opinions

Bradley v. Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) 433 F. 2d 897 (6th Cir. 1970); October 13, 1970.

Bradley v. Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) 438 F. 2d 945 (6th Cir. 1971); February 22, 1971.

Bradley v. Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) 338 F. Supp. 582 (E.D. Mi. 1971); September 27, 1971.

Bradley v. Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) 468 F. 2d 902 (6th Cir. 1972); February 23, 1972.

Bradley v. Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) 345 F. Supp. 914 (E.D. Mi. 1972); June 14, 1972.

Bradley v. Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) 484 F. 2d 215 (6th Cir. 1973); June 12, 1973.

Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) v. Bradley #418 U.S. 717, 41 L. Ed. 2d 1069, 94 S. Ct. 3112 (1974); July 25, 1974. (Milliken I)

Bradley v. Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) #519 F. 2d 679 (6th Cir. 1975); June 19, 1975. (Bus Purchase)

Bradley v. Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) 402 F. Supp. 1096 (E.D. Mi. 1975); August 15, 1975. (Plan)

Bradley v. Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) #411 F. Supp. 943 (E.D. Mi. 1975); November 4, 1975.

Bradley v. Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) #411 F. Supp. 937 (E.D. Mi. 1975); December 19, 1975.

Bradley v. Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) 540 F. 2d 229 (6th Cir. 1976); August 4, 1976.

Bradley v. Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) #426 F. Supp. 929 (E.D. Mi. 1977).

Bradley v. Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) 432 F. Supp. 885 (E.D. Mi. 1977); May 17, 1977.

Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) v. Bradley 433 U.S. 267, 53 L. Ed. 2d 745, 97 S. Ct. 2749 (1977); June 27, 1977. (Milliken II)

Bradley v. Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) 460 F. Supp. 299 (E.D. Mi. 1978); August 7, 1978. (Plan)

Bradley v. Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) 460 F. Supp. 320 (E.D. Mi. 1978); September 1, 1978.

Bradley v. Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) 460 F. Supp. 325 (E.D. Mi. 1978); November 17, 1978.

Bradley v. Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) 466 F. Supp. 307 (E.D. Mi. 1979); February 26, 1979.

Bradley v. Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) 476 F. Supp. 257 (E.D. Mi. 1979); September 6, 1979.

Bradley v. Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) 620 F. 2d 1143 (6th Cir. 1980); April 14, 1980.

Bradley v. Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) 495 F. Supp. 217 (E.D. Mi. 1980); August 8, 1980.

Bradley v. Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) 585 F. Supp. 348 (E.D. Mi. 1984); April 24, 1984.

Bradley v. Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) #772 F. 2d 266 (6th Cir. 1985).

B. Unreported Opinions

Bradley v. Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) December 8, 1972. (6th Cir. 1972) (Vac 484 F. 2d 215 1973)

Bradley v. Milliken (Board of Education, Sch. Dist. of Detroit) May 21, 1975.

C. Other Documents

Hain, E., "Sealing Off the City: School Desegregation in Detroit," in H. Kalodner and J. Fishman (Eds.), *The Limits of Justice* (1978).

Wolf, E., *Trial and Error: The Detroit School Desegregation Case* (1981).

GRAND RAPIDS, MI

A. Reported Opinions

Higgins v. Board of Education of the City of Grand Rapids 395 F. Supp. 444 (1973); July 18, 1973.

Higgins v. Board of Education of the City of Grand Rapids 508 F. 2d 779 (1974); December 6, 1974.

C. Other Documents

Burt, Walter F., "Desegregation Efforts in the Grand Rapids Public Schools: 1954–1979." Ann Arbor, MI: Published Report, 1981.

LANSING, MI

A. Reported Opinions

Jipping v. Lansing School District #15 Mi. App. 441, 166 N.W. 2d 472 (1968).

NAACP v. Lansing Board of Education 465 F. 2d 569 (6th Cir. 1973); August 29, 1973.

NAACP v. Lansing Board of Education 429 F. Supp. 583 (W.D. Mi. 1976); May 17, 1976.

NAACP v. Lansing Board of Education 559 F. 2d 1042 (6th Cir. 1977); July 26, 1977.

NAACP v. Lansing Board of Education 581 F. 2d 115 (6th Cir. 1978); February 8, 1978.

B. Unreported Opinions

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People v. Lansing Board of Education December 19, 1975. (Order)

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People v. Lansing Board of Education
December 19, 1975. (Opinion)

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People v. Lansing Board of Education
May 18, 1976. (Order Regarding Final Desegregation Plan)

C. Other Documents

Lansing School District, "History of the Progress Toward Integration in the Lansing School District," 1970.

Lansing School District, "Report of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Educational Opportunity," April 20, 1972.

Lansing School District, "A Report to the Lansing School District Board of Education," August, 1975.

Lansing School District, "A Brief History of School Desegregation Litigation in Lansing," in Schools in Review, April, 1978.

Brown, Judith A., Director of Information Services, Lansing School District. Letter, April 15, 1981.

SAGINAW, MI

A. Reported Opinions

School District of Saginaw v. United States Department of HEW
431 F. Supp. 147 (S.D. Mi. 1977); March 9, 1977.

MINNEAPOLIS, MN

A. Reported Opinions

Booker v. Special School District No. 1, Minneapolis
351 F. Supp. 799 (D. Mn. 1972); May 24, 1972.

Booker v. Special School District No. 1, Minneapolis
451 F. Supp. 659 (D. Mn. 1978); May 22, 1978.

Booker v. Special School District No. 1, Minneapolis
585 F. 2d 347 (8th Cir. 1978); October 12, 1978.

B. Unreported Opinions

Booker v. Special School District No. 1, Minneapolis
May 24, 1972.

Booker v. Special School District No. 1, Minneapolis
May 7, 1975.

Booker v. Special School District No. 1, Minneapolis
July 11, 1975.

Booker v. Special School District No. 1, Minneapolis

August 8, 1975.

C. Other Documents

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, "School Desegregation in Minneapolis, Minnesota," May 1977.

KANSAS CITY, MO

A. Reported Opinions

School District of Kansas City (Jenkins) v. State of Missouri
460 F. Supp. 421 (W.D. Mo. 1978); October 6, 1978.

School District of Kansas City (Jenkins) v. State of Missouri
592 F. 2d 493 (8th Cir. 1979); February 16, 1979.

Jenkins v. State of Missouri (and Kansas City, Mo.)
xxx F. Supp. xx (W.D. Mo. 1978); June 5, 1984.

Jenkins v. State of Missouri (and Kansas City, Mo.)
593 F. Supp. 1485 (W.D. Mo. 1984); September 17, 1984.

Jenkins v. State of Missouri (and Kansas City, Mo.)
xxx F. Supp. xx (W.D. Mo. 1985); June 14, 1985.

Jenkins v. State of Missouri (and Kansas City, Mo.)
xxx F. Supp. xx (W.D. Mo. 1986); June 16, 1986.

C. Other Documents

"School Integration Program for School District of Kansas City, Missouri." Approved by the Board of Directors of the School District of Kansas City, Missouri, March 10, 1977.

Plan Report from School District of Kansas City, School Integration Program (1977).

ST. LOUIS, MO

A. Reported Opinions

Liddell v. Board of Education of City of St. Louis
546 F. 2d 768 (8th Cir. 1976); December 13, 1976. (Liddell I)

Liddell v. Board of Education of City of St. Louis
553 F. 2d 557 (8th Cir. 1977); January 28, 1977. (Liddell II)

Liddell v. Board of Education of City of St. Louis
469 F. Supp. 1304 (E.D. Mo. 1979); April 12, 1979.

Adams (Liddell) v. United States
620 F. 2d 1277 (8th Cir. 1980); March 3, 1980.

Liddell v. Board of Education of City of St. Louis
491 F. Supp. 351 (E.D. Mo. 1980); May 21, 1980.

Liddell v. Board of Education of City of St. Louis

505 F. Supp. 654 (E.D. Mo. 1980); November 14, 1980.
Liddell v. Board of Education of City of St. Louis
508 F. Supp. 101 (E.D. Mo. 1980); December 19, 1980.
Liddell v. Board of Education of City of St. Louis
667 F. 2d 643 (8th Cir. 1981); March 12, 1981. (Liddell III)
Liddell v. Board of Education of City of St. Louis
693 F. 2d 721 (8th Cir. 1981); December 2, 1981. (Liddell IV)
Liddell v. Board of Education of City of St. Louis
677 F. 2d 626 (8th Cir. 1982); February 25, 1982. (Liddell V)
Liddell v. Board of Education of City of St. Louis
567 F. Supp. 1037 (E.D. Mo. 1983); July 5, 1983.
Liddell v. Board of Education of City of St. Louis
717 F. 2d 1180 (8th Cir. 1983); September 13, 1982. (Liddell VI)
Liddell v. Board of Education of City of St. Louis
731 F. 2d 1294 (8th Cir. 1984); March 5, 1984. (Liddell VII)
Liddell v. Board of Education of City of St. Louis
758 F. 2d 290 (8th Cir. 1985).

B. Unreported Opinions

United States v. State of Missouri
November 21, 1973. (Updated November 15, 1974)
Liddell v. The Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, Missouri
June 3, 1980. (Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law)
Liddell v. The Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, Missouri
July 2, 1981. (12a Plan)

C. Other Documents

The Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, "The Desegregation Plan of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis." Amended May 8, May 12, and May 15 of 1980.
Voluntary Interdistrict Coordinating Council, First Report to the Federal District Court. 1984.
Voluntary Interdistrict Coordinating Council, Second Report to the Federal District Court. 1985.
Robyn, Dorothy, St. Louis. 1978
Monti, Daniel, "Semblance of Justice: St. Louis School Desegregation and Order in Urban America." University of Missouri Press, 1985.

OMAHA, NE

A. Reported Opinions

United States v. The School District of Omaha, State of Nebraska
367 F. Supp. 179 (D. Ne. 1973); October 26, 1973.

United States v. The School District of Omaha, State of Nebraska
389 F. Supp. 293 (D. Ne. 1974); October 15, 1974.

United States v. The School District of Omaha, State of Nebraska
521 F. 2d 530 (8th Cir. 1975); June 12, 1975.

United States v. The School District of Omaha, State of Nebraska
418 F. Supp. 22 (D. Ne. 1976); April 27, 1976.

United States v. The School District of Omaha, State of Nebraska
541 F. 2d 708 (8th Cir. 1976); August 24, 1976.

United States v. The School District of Omaha, State of Nebraska
#433 U.S. 607, 97 S.Ct. 2905, 53 L.Ed. 2d 1039.

United States v. The School District of Omaha, State of Nebraska
565 F. 2d 127 (8th Cir. 1977); October 21, 1977.

United States v. The School District of Omaha, State of Nebraska
575 F. Supp. 1398 (D. Ne. 1983); November 29, 1983.

B. Unreported Opinions

United States v. School District of Omaha
January 15, 1976.

United States v. School District of Omaha
February 18, 1976. (Memorandum Opinion)

United States v. School District of Omaha
February 23, 1976.

United States v. School District of Omaha
May 24, 1976.

United States v. School District of Omaha
June 21, 1976.

United States v. School District of Omaha
May 6, 1977.

United States v. School District of Omaha
September 26, 1977.

United States v. School District of Omaha
June 26, 1979.

United States v. School District of Omaha
June 13, 1980. (Plan)

United States v. School District of Omaha

September 17, 1984. (Unitary)

C. Other Documents

"United States District Court Desegregation Plan for the School District of Omaha," May 21, 1976.

Office of Public Information, Omaha Public Schools, "The Plan: Desegregation of the Omaha Public Schools 1980–81."

Mihelich, D. and A. W. Welsh, "Omaha, Nebraska: Positive Planning for Peaceful Desegregation," in C. Willie and S. Greenblatt (Eds.), *Community Politics and Educational Change*, (1981).

CLARK COUNTY, NV

A. Reported Opinions

Kelly v. Guinn (Clark County, Las Vegas, School District) 456 F. 2d 100 (9th Cir. 1972); February 22, 1972.

C. Other Documents

Clark County School District, "Desegregation Report," July, 1974.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, "School Desegregation in Ten Communities," (1973).

BUFFALO, NY

A. Reported Opinions

Arthur v. Nyquist (Buffalo) 415 F. Supp. 904 (W.D. N.Y. 1976); April 30, 1976.

Arthur v. Nyquist (Buffalo) 429 F. Supp. 206 (W.D. N.Y. 1977); March 1, 1977.

Arthur v. Nyquist (Buffalo) 573 F. 2d 134 (2nd Cir. 134); March 8, 1978.

Arthur v. Nyquist (Buffalo) 473 F. Supp. 830 (W.D. N.Y. 1979); June 6, 1979.

Arthur v. Nyquist (Buffalo) 636 F. 2d 905 (2nd Cir. 1981); January 5, 1981.

Arthur v. Nyquist (Buffalo) 514 F. Supp. 1133 (W.D. N.Y. 1981); May 19, 1981.

Arthur v. Nyquist (Buffalo) 520 F. Supp. 961 (W.D. N.Y. 1981); August 21, 1981.

Arthur v. Nyquist (Buffalo) 547 F. Supp. 468 (W.D. N.Y. 1982); August 27, 1982.

Arthur v. Nyquist (Buffalo) 566 F. Supp. 511 (W.D. N.Y. 1983); May 23, 1983.

Arthur v. Nyquist (Buffalo)
712 F. 2d 809 (2nd Cir. 1983); July 22, 1983.
Arthur v. Nyquist (Buffalo)
712 F. 2d 816 (2nd Cir. 1983); July 22, 1983.

B. Unreported Opinions

Arthur v. Nyquist (Buffalo)
426 F. Supp. 191 (W.D. N.Y. 1976).
Arthur v. Nyquist (Buffalo)
547 F. 2d 7 (2nd Cir. 1976).

C. Other Documents

Buffalo Public Schools, "Desegregation Plan in Response to an Order of the United States." District Court-Western District of New York, January 5, 1977.

Buffalo Evening News, "Text of Judge Curtin's Desegregation Ruling," April 30, 1976.

Buffalo Public Schools, "The Buffalo Plan," May 18, 1976.

Buffalo Public Schools, "Buffalo Public Schools Desegregation Plan." November 15, 1979.

Buffalo Board of Education, Phase III and the U.S. District Court Order of June 19, 1980.

NEW YORK, NY

A. Reported Opinions

Hart v. Community School Board of Brooklyn, New York
383 F. Supp. 699; 1974.

ROCHESTER, NY

C. Other Documents

City School District, Rochester, New York, "Grade Reorganization and Desegregation of the Rochester Public Schools," December 1969.

City School District, Rochester, New York, "Final Report: A Three Year Longitudinal Study to Assess a Fifteen Point Plan to Reduce Racial Isolation and Provide Quality Integrated Education for Elementary School Pupils," September, 1970.

City School District, Rochester, New York, "Supplement to theGrade Reorganization and Desegregation of the Rochester PublicSchools," May, 1971.

YONKERS, NY

A. Reported Opinions

United States v. Yonkers Board of Education
518 F. Supp. 191 (S.D. N.Y. 1981).

United States v. Yonkers Board of Education
594 F. Supp. 486 (S.D. N.Y. 1984).

United States v. Yonkers Board of Education
624 F. Supp. 1276 (S.D. N.Y. 1985); November 20, 1985.

United States v. Yonkers Board of Education
635 F. Supp. 1538 (S.D. N.Y. 1986); May 13, 1986.

United States v. Yonkers Board of Education
635 F. Supp. 1577 (S.D. N.Y. 1986); May 28, 1986.

CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG COUNTY, NC

A. Reported Opinions

Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education
300 F. Supp. 1358 (W.D. N.C. 1969); April 23, 1969.

Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education
300 F. Supp. 1381 (W.D. N.C. 1969); June 20, 1969.

Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education
306 F. Supp. 1291 (W.D. N.C. 1969); August 15, 1969.

Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education
306 F. Supp. 1299 (W.D. N.C. 1969); November 7, 1969.

Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education
311 F. Supp. 265 (W.D. N.C. 1970); February 5, 1970. (Plan)

Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education
431 F. 2d 135 (4th Cir. 1970); April 7, 1970.

Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education
312 F. Supp. 503 (W.D. N.C. 1970); April 28, 1970.

Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education
431 F. 2d 138 (4th Cir. 1970); May 26, 1970.

Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education
318 F. Supp. 786 (W.D. N.C. 1970); August 3, 1970.

Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education
402 U.S. 1 (S.Ct. 1971); April 20, 1971

Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education
328 F. Supp. 1346 (W.D. N.C. 1971); June 29, 1971.

Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education
334 F. Supp. 623 (W.D. N.C. 1971); October 21, 1971.

Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education
362 F. Supp. 1223 (W.D. N.C. 1973); June 19, 1973.
Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education
489 F. 2d 966 (4th Cir. 1974); January 15, 1974.
Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education
379 F. Supp. 1102 (W.D. N.C. 1974); July 30, 1974. (Plan)
Martin (Swann) v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education
475 F. Supp. 1318 (W.D. N.C. 1979); August 10, 1979.
Martin (Swann) v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education
626 F. 2d 1165 (4th Cir. 1980); July 23, 1980.

C. Other Documents

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Five Communities: Their Search for Equal Education* (1972).
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *School Desegregation in Ten Communities* (1973).
Ross, M., White Flight Bibliography.

NEW HANOVER COUNTY (WILMINGTON), NC

A. Reported Opinions

Eaton v. New Hanover County Board of Education
330 F. Supp. 78 (E.D. N.C. 1971); July 23, 1971.
Eaton v. New Hanover County Board of Education
459 F. Supp. 684 (5th Cir. 1972); April 26, 1972.

B. Unreported Opinions

Eaton v. New Hanover County Board of Education
July 22, 1971. (Memorandum and Order)
Eaton v. New Hanover County Board of Education
January 12, 1975.
Eaton v. New Hanover County Board of Education
January 12, 1976.

AKRON, OH

A. Reported Opinions

Bell v. Board of Education, Akron Public Schools
491 F. Supp. 916 (N.D. Oh. 1980); April 7, 1980
Bell v. Board of Education, Akron Public Schools
683 F. 2d 963 (6th Cir. 1982); July 8, 1982.

B. Unreported Opinions

Arnold v. Ott

#No. G65–707 (N.D. Oh. 1968); October 16, 1968.

D. Related Cases

Akron Board of Education v. State Board of Education of Ohio
490 F 2d 1285 (6th Cir. 1974); January 15, 1974.

CINCINNATI, OH

A. Reported Opinions

Bronson v. Board of Education City School District City of Cincinnati
512 F. 2d 718 (6th Cir. 1975); February 28, 1975.

Board of Education City School District City of Cincinnati v. HEW
396 F. Supp. 203 (S.D. Oh. 1975); April 18, 1975.

Bronson v. Board of Education City School District City of Cincinnati
525 F. 2d 344 (6th Cir. 1975); September 24, 1975.

Board of Education City School District City of Cincinnati v. HEW
532 F. 2d 1070 (6th Cir. 1976); March 31, 1976.

Bronson v. Board of Education City School District City of Cincinnati
510 F. Supp. 1251 (S.D. Oh. 1980); October 16, 1980.

Bronson v. Board of Education City School District City of Cincinnati
535 F. Supp. 846 (S.D. Oh. 1982); February 11, 1982.

Bronson v. Board of Education City School District City of Cincinnati
687 F. 2d 836 (6th Cir. 1982); August 31, 1982.

Bronson v. Board of Education City School District City of Cincinnati
550 F. Supp. 941 (S.D. Oh. 1982); September 24, 1982.

Bronson v. Board of Education City School District City of Cincinnati
573 F. Supp. 759 (S.D. Oh. 1983); March 14, 1983.

Bronson v. Board of Education City School District City of Cincinnati
573 F. Supp. 767 (S.D. Oh. 1983); August 2, 1983.

Bronson v. Board of Education City School District City of Cincinnati

578 F. Supp. 1098 (S.D. Oh. 1984); January 10, 1984.

Bronson v. Board of Education City School District City of Cincinnati

604 F. Supp. 68 (S.D. Oh. 1984); June 22, 1984.

B. Unreported Opinions

Bronson v. Board of Education City School District City of Cincinnati

January 9, 1975. (Mod 525 F. 2d 344 (1975))

C. Other Documents

Waldrip, D., "Alternative Programs in Cincinnati..." in D. Levine and R. Havingshurst (Eds.), *The Future of Big City Schools* (1977).

Felix, J. and J. Jacobs, "Issue in Implementing and Evaluating Programs in Cincinnati," in D. Levine and R. Havingshurst (Eds.), *The Future of Big City Schools*, (1977).

CLEVELAND, OH

A. Reported Opinions

Reed v. Rhodes (Cleveland)

422 F. Supp. 708 (N.D. Oh. 1976); August 31, 1976.

Reed v. Rhodes (Cleveland)

549 F. 2d 1046 (6th Cir. 1976); September 20, 1976.

Reed v. Rhodes (Cleveland)

549 F. 2d 1050 (6th Cir. 1976); November 17, 1976.

Reed v. Rhodes (Cleveland)

#549 F. 2d 1220 (6th Cir. 1976).

Reed v. Rhodes (Cleveland)

455 F. Supp. 546 (N.D. Oh. 1978); February 6, 1978.

Reed v. Rhodes (Cleveland)

455 F. Supp. 569 (N.D. Oh. 1978); February 6, 1978. (Plan)

Reed v. Cleveland Board of Education

581 F. 2d 570 (6th Cir. 1978); July 6, 1978.

Reed v. Rhodes (Cleveland)

472 F. Supp. 603 (N.D. Oh. 1979); May 14, 1979.

Reed v. Rhodes (Cleveland)

472 F. Supp. 612 (N.D. Oh. 1979); May 15, 1979.

Reed v. Rhodes (Cleveland)

472 F. Supp. 615 (N.D. Oh. 1979); May 15, 1979.

Reed v. Rhodes (Cleveland)

472 F. Supp. 618 (N.D. Oh. 1979); May 16, 1979.

Reed v. Rhodes (Cleveland)

472 F. Supp. 623 (N.D. Oh. 1979); May 17, 1979.

Reed v. Rhodes (Cleveland)

607 F. 2d 714 (6th Cir. 1979); August 23, 1979.

Reed v. Cleveland Board of Education

607 F. 2d 737 (6th Cir. 1979); August 27, 1979.

Reed v. Rhodes (Cleveland)

#607 F. 2d 749 (6th Cir. 1979); August 27, 1979.

Reed v. Rhodes (Cleveland)

500 F. Supp. 404 (N.D. Oh. 1980); September 23, 1980.

Reed v. Rhodes (Cleveland)

635 F. 2d 556 (6th Cir. 1980); December 8, 1980.

Reed v. Rhodes (Cleveland)

642 F. 2d 186 (6th Cir. 1981); February 19, 1981.

Reed v. Rhodes (Cleveland)

516 F. Supp. 561 (N.D. Oh. 1981); June 10, 1981. (Special Master)

Reed v. Rhodes (Cleveland)

662 F. 2d 1219 (6th Cir. 1981); October 21, 1981.

Reed v. Rhodes (Cleveland)

691 F. 2d 266 (6th Cir. 1982); October 20, 1982. (Special Master)

Reed v. Rhodes (Cleveland)

598 F. Supp. 248 (N.D. Oh. 1984); November 27, 1984.

B. Unreported Opinions

Reed v. Rhodes, et al.

June 16, 1978. (Order)

C. Other Documents

Stevens, L. and M. Weinburg, "More Than a Bus Ride: The Desegregation of Cleveland Public Schools," (1985).

COLUMBUS, OH

A. Reported Opinions

Penick v. Columbus Board of Education

429 F. Supp. 229 (S.D. Oh. 1977); March 8, 1977.

Penick v. Columbus Board of Education

583 F. 2d 787 (6th Cir. 1978); July 14, 1978.

Penick v. Columbus Board of Education

443 U.S. 449, 61 L.Ed. 2d 666, 99 S.Ct. 2941; July 2, 1979.

Penick v. Columbus Board of Education
519 F. Supp. 925 (S.D. Oh. 1981); January 8, 1981.

Penick v. Columbus Board of Education
663 F. 2d 24 (6th Cir. 1981); October 21, 1981.

Penick v. Columbus Board of Education ; 1985 (case dismissed).

B. Unreported Opinions

Penick v. Columbus Board of Education
July 7, 1977

Penick v. Columbus Board of Education
July 29, 1977

C. Other Documents

"Columbus Board of Education's Response to the Court's July 29, 1977 Order," August 31, 1977.

Columbus Public Schools, "Report on the Status of Desegregation to the Federal District Court," November 16, 1979.

Columbus Public Schools, "Report to the Federal District Court on the Status of Desegregation," March 17, 1980.

Columbus Public Schools, "Report to the Federal District Court on the Status of Desegregation," July 17, 1980.

Columbus Public Schools, "Final Report of the First Year of Desegregation, 1979–80," August, 1980.

DAYTON, OH

A. Reported Opinions

Brinkman v. Gilligan (Dayton Board of Education)
503 F. 2d 684 (6th Cir. 1974); August 20, 1974.

Brinkman v. Gilligan (Dayton Board of Education)
518 F. 2d 853 (6th Cir. 1975); June 24, 1975.

Brinkman v. Gilligan (Dayton Board of Education)
539 F. 2d 1084 (6th Cir. 1976); July 26, 1976.

Brinkman v. Gilligan (Dayton Board of Education)
#433 U.S. 406, 53 L.Ed. 2d 851, 97 S.Ct. 2766 (1977). (Dayton I)

Brinkman v. Gilligan (Dayton Board of Education)
561 F. 2d 652 (6th Cir. 1977); August 25, 1977.

Brinkman v. Gilligan (Dayton Board of Education)
446 F. Supp. 1232 (S.D. Oh. 1977); December 15, 1977.

Brinkman v. Gilligan (Dayton Board of Education)
583 F. 2d 243 (6th Cir. 1978); July 27, 1978.

Dayton Board of Education v. Brinkman
443 U.S. 526, 61 L.Ed. 2d 720, 99 S.Ct. 2971 (1979); July 2, 1979. (Dayton II)

Brinkman v. Gilligan (Dayton Board of Education)
610 F. Supp. 1288 (S.D. Oh. 1985); May 24, 1985.

B. Unreported Opinions

Brinkman v. Gilligan (Dayton Board of Education)
#December 29, 1975.

Brinkman v. Gilligan (Dayton Board of Education)
#March 25, 1976.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OK

A. Reported Opinions

Dowell v. Board of Education of the Oklahoma City Public Sch[illegible]
375 F. 2d 158 (10th Cir. 1967); January 23, 1967.

Dowell v. Board of Education of the Oklahoma City Public Schools
#307 F. Supp. 583 (W.D. Ok. 1970); January 17, 1970.

Dowell v. Board of Education of the Oklahoma City Public Schools
430 F. 2d 865 (10th Cir. 1970); July 29, 1970.

Dowell v. Board of Education of the Oklahoma City Public Schools
#430 F. 2d 871 (10th Cir. 1970); July 29, 1970.

Dowell v. Board of Education of the Oklahoma City Public Schools
338 F. Supp. 1256 (W.D. Ok. 1972); February 1, 1972. (Plan)

Dowell v. Board of Education of the Oklahoma City Public Schools
465 F. 2d 1012 (10th Cir. 1972); August 4, 1972.

Dowell v. Board of Education of the Oklahoma City Public Schools
606 F. Supp. 1548 (W.D. Ok. 1985); April 25, 1985.

Dowell v. Board of Education of the Oklahoma City Public Schools
xxx F. 2d xx (10th Cir. 1986); June 26, 1986.

B. Unreported Opinions

Dowell v. Board of Education of the Oklahoma City Public Schools
December 3, 1971. (Plan)

Dowell v. Board of Education of the Oklahoma City Public Schools
#January 18, 1977. (Unitary)

C. Other Documents

Oklahoma City Public Schools Board of Education, "Student Assignment Plan for 1985–86." Revised April 9, 1985.

TULSA, OK

A. Reported Opinions

United States v. Board of Education, Independent School District No. 1, Tulsa County
429 F. 2d 1253 (10th Cir. 1970); July 28, 1970.

United States v. Board of Education, Independent School District No. 1, Tulsa County
459 F. 2d 720 (10th Cir. 1972); May 5, 1972.

United States v. Board of Education, Independent School District No. 1, Tulsa County
476 F. 2d 621 (10th Cir. 1973); April 10, 1973.

United States v. Board of Education, Independent School District No. 1, Tulsa County
492 F. 2d 1189 (10th Cir. 1974); March 29, 1974.

C. Other Documents

Howell, Bruce, Superintendent, "Neither Black nor White: AProgressReport on Integration in the Tulsa Public Schools," (1974).

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, "School Desegregation in Tulsa, Oklahoma," (1977).

PORTLAND, OR

C. Other Documents

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, "School Desegregation in Portland, Oregon," September, 1977.

PHILADELPHIA, PA

A. Reported Opinions

Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission v. School District of Philadelphia
#294 A. 2d 410 (Pa. Commonwealth 1972); August 17, 1972.

Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission v. School District of Philadelphia
#352 A. 2d 200 (Pa. Commonwealth 1976); February 13, 1976.

Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission v. School District of Philadelphia

374 A. 2d 1014 (Pa. Commonwealth 1977); July 1, 1977.

Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission v. School District of Philadelphia
390 A. 2d 1238 (Pa. Commonwealth 1978); August 11, 1978.

Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission v. School District of Philadelphia
443 A. 2d 1343 (Pa. Commonwealth 1982); April 15, 1982.

C. Other Documents

School District of Philadelphia, "Report on the Status of the Voluntary Desegregation Plan of the School District of Philadelphia," January 22, 1980, revised March 24, 1980.

PITTSBURGH, PA

A. Reported Opinions

Pennsylvania Human Relations v. School District of Pittsburg
#294 A. 2d 410 (Pa. Commonwealth 1972); August 17, 1972.

Zebra v. Pittsburg School District
#296 A. 2d 748 (Pa. Commonwealth 1973); November 17, 1972.

Pennsylvania Human Relations Comm. v. Sch. Dist. of Pittsburg
367 A. 2d 829 (Pa. Commonwealth 1977); January 13, 1977.

Hayes v. School District of Pittsburg
381 A. 2d 193 (Pa. Commonwealth 1977); December 19, 1977.

Rankin v. School District of Pittsburg
#381 A. 2d 195 (Pa. Commonwealth 1977); December 19, 1977.

Pennsylvania Human Relations v. School District of Pittsburg
390 A. 2d 1238 (Pa. Commonwealth 1978); August 11, 1978.

Rankin v. School District of Pittsburg
396 A. 2d 856 (Pa. Commonwealth 1978); December 13, 1978.

National Association for Neighborhood Schools v. School District of Pittsburg
497 F. Supp. 471 (W.D. Pa. 1980); September 18, 1980.

National Association for Neighborhood Schools v. School District of Pittsburg
90 F.R.D. 398 (W.D. PA. 1981); May 29, 1981.

Pennsylvania Human Relations Comm. v. Sch. Dist. of Pittsburg
444 A. 2d 792 (Pa. Commonwealth 1982); April 30, 1982.

C. Other Documents

The School District of Pittsburgh, "The Pittsburgh Desegregation

Plan," June 14, 1979.

The School District of Pittsburgh, "Amended Pittsburgh Desegregation Plan," March 14, 1980.

GREENVILLE COUNTY, SC

A. Reported Opinions

Whittenberg v. School District of Greenville County, S.C. 298 F. Supp. 784 (D. S.C. 1969); March 31, 1969.

Whittenberg v. School District of Greenville County, S.C. 424 F. 2d 195 (5th Cir. 1970); January 19, 1970.

Whittenberg v. School District of Greenville County, S.C. 607 F. Supp. 289 (D. S.C.); March 11, 1985.

C. Other Documents

The School District of Greenville County, "Desegregation ... A Model Plan," July, 1975.

MEMPHIS, TN

A. Reported Opinions

Northcross v. Board of Education of Memphis City Schools #420 F. 2d 546 (6th Cir. 1969); December 19, 1969.

Northcross v. Board of Education of Memphis City Schools #397 U.S. 232; March 9, 1970.

Northcross v. Board of Education of Memphis City Schools 312 F. Supp. 1150 (W.D. Tn. 1970); May 1, 1970.

Northcross v. Board of Education of Memphis City Schools 444 F. 2d 1179 (6th Cir. 1971); June 7, 1971.

Northcross v. Board of Education of Memphis City Schools 444 F. 2d 1184 (6th Cir. 1971); June 7, 1971.

Northcross v. Board of Education of Memphis City Schools 341 F. Supp. 583 (W.D. Tn. 1972); April 20, 1972.

Northcross v. Board of Education of Memphis City Schools #462 F. 2d 329 (6th Cir. 1972); July 5, 1972.

Northcross v. Board of Education of Memphis City Schools 466 F. 2d 890 (6th Cir. 1972); August 29, 1972.

Northcross v. Board of Education of Memphis City Schools 489 F. 2d 15 (6th Cir. 1973); December 4, 1973.

Northcross v. Board of Education of Memphis City Schools 489 F. 2d 18 (6th Cir. 1973); December 4, 1973.

Northcross v. Board of Education of Memphis City Schools

489 F. 2d 19 (6th Cir. 1973); December 4, 1973.

C. Other Documents

Egerton, John, "Promise of Progress: Memphis School Desegregation 1972–1973." Atlanta: Southern Regional Council, 1973.

Board of Education, Memphis City School System, "Plan Z: Elementary, Junior, and Senior High School Plans," May 3, 1973.

Kelly, Ernest G., Jr., Attorney. Cobb, Edwards, Hamlet, Nichol & Woodall, Memphis, Tennessee. Letter November 28, 1973.

Memphis City Schools, "Student Assignment Revisions," February 22, 1982.

NASHVILLE-DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN

A. Reported Opinions

Kelley v. Metropolitan County Board of Education of Nashville and Davidson County
317 F. Supp. 980 (M.D. Tn. 1970); July 16, 1970.

Kelley v. Metropolitan County Board of Education of Nashville and Davidson County
436 F. 2d 856 (6th Cir. 1970); December 18, 1970.

Kelley v. Metropolitan County Board of Education of Nashville and Davidson County
463 F. 2d 732 (6th Cir. 1972); May 30, 1972.

Kelley v. Metropolitan County Board of Education of Nashville and Davidson County
372 F. Supp. 528 (M.D. Tn. 1973); February 23, 1973.

Kelley v. Metropolitan County Board of Education of Nashville and Davidson County
479 F. 2d 810 (6th Cir. 1973); June 6, 1973.

Kelley v. Metropolitan County Board of Education of Nashville and Davidson County
372 F. Supp. 540 (M.D. Tn. 1973); December 19, 1973.

Kelley v. Metropolitan County Board of Education of Nashville and Davidson County
479 F. Supp. 120 (M.D. Tn. 1979); August 27, 1979.

Kelley v. Metropolitan County Board of Education of Nashville and Davidson County
492 F. Supp. 167 (M.D. Tn.); May 20, 1980.

Kelley v. Metropolitan County Board of Education of Nashville and Davidson County

511 F. Supp. 1363 (M.D. Tn. 1981); April 17, 1981.

Kelley v. Metropolitan County Board of Education of Nashville and Davidson County
687 F. 2d 814 (6th Cir. 1982); July 27, 1982.

Kelley v. Metropolitan County Board of Education of Nashville and Davidson County
572 F. Supp. 317 (M.D. Tn. 1983); June 1, 1983.

Kelley v. Metropolitan County Board of Education of Nashville and Davidson County
755 F. 2d 67 (6th Cir. 1985); February 12, 1985.

C. Other Documents

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, "School Desegregation in Nashville-Davidson, Tennessee," 1977.

Pride, Richard and J. David Woodward, "The Burden of Busing: The Politics of Desegregation in Nashville, Tennessee," (1985).

AMARILLO, TX

C. Other Documents

Amarillo Public Schools, "Desegregation Plan 1970–71."

Amarillo Public Schools, "Desegregation Plan." July 19, 1971.

Amarillo Public Schools, "Implementation of Desegregation Plan." April 12, 1972.

AUSTIN, TX

A. Reported Opinions

United States v. Texas Education Agency (Austin Independent School District)
467 F. 2d 848 (5th Cir. 1972); August 2, 1972.

United States v. Texas Education Agency (Austin Independent School District)
532 F. 2d 380 (5th Cir. 1976); May 13, 1976.

United States v. Texas Education Agency (Austin Independent School District)
429 U.S. 990, 97 S.Ct. 517, 50 L.Ed. 2d 603 (1976); December 6, 1976.

United States v. Texas Education Agency (Austin Independent School District)
564 F. 2d 162 (5th Cir. 1977); November 21, 1977.

United States v. Texas Education Agency (Austin Independent School District)
579 F. 2d 910 (5th Cir. 1978); September 7, 1978.

B. Unreported Opinions

United States v. Texas Education Agency (Austin Independent School District)
June 20, 1971.

United States v. Texas Education Agency (Austin Independent School District)
July 19, 1971.

United States v. Texas Education Agency (Austin Independent School District)
August 1, 1973.

United States v. Texas Education Agency (Austin Independent School District)
December 6, 1976.

United States v. Texas Education Agency (Austin Independent School District)
November 5, 1979. (Plan)

United States v. Texas Education Agency (Austin Independent School District)
January 2, 1980. (Consent Decree)

United States v. Texas Education Agency (Austin Independent School District)
June 14, 1983. (Case Dismissed)

C. Other Documents

Austin Independent School District, "A Background of Integration in the Austin Independent School District and Summary of the Desegregation Plan Currently Being Implemented in the Austin Independent School District." (No Date)

Austin Independent School District, "A Chronology of Some of the Major Events Relative to School Desegregation." (No Date)

Austin Independent School District, "Key Periods of Desegregation Activity in the Austin Independent School District." (No Date)

Egerton, John, "School Desegregation: A Report Card From the South." Atlanta: Southern Regional Council, 1976.

DALLAS, TX

A. Reported Opinions

Tasby v. Estes (Wright) (Dallas Independent School District)
342 F. Supp. 945 (N.D. Tx. 1971); July 16, 1971.

United States v. State of Texas (Highland Park Independent School District)
356 F. Supp. 469 (N.D. Tx. 1972); September 3, 1972.

United States v. State of Texas (Highland Park Independent School District)
#466 F. 2d 518 (5th Cir. 1972).

Tasby v. Estes (Wright) (Dallas Independent School District)
517 F. 2d 92 (5th Cir. 1975); July 23, 1975.

Tasby v. Estes (Wright) (Dallas Independent School District)
412 F. Supp. 1192 (N.D. Tx. 1976); April 7, 1976. (Plan)

Tasby v. Estes (Wright) (Dallas Independent School District)
#412 F. Supp. 1185 (N.D. Tx. 1976).

Tasby v. Estes (Wright) (Dallas Independent School District)
572 F. 2d 1010 (5th Cir. 1978); April 21, 1978.

Tasby v. Estes (Wright) (Dallas Independent School District)
444 U.S. 437, 62 L.Ed. 2d 626, 100 S.Ct. 716; January 21, 1980.

Tasby v. Estes (Wright) (Dallas Independent School District)
520 F. Supp. 683 (N.D. Tx. 1981); August 3, 1981.

Tasby v. Estes (Wright) (Dallas Independent School District)
542 F. Supp. 134 (N.D. Tx. 1981); December 7, 1981.

Tasby v. Estes (Wright) (Dallas Independent School District)
559 F. Supp. 9 (N.D. Tx. 1982); August 4, 1982.

Tasby v. Estes (Wright) (Dallas Independent School District)
713 F. 2d 90 (5th Cir. 1983); August 11, 1983.

Tasby v. Estes (Wright) (Dallas Independent School District)
585 F. Supp. 453 (N.D. Tx. 1984); April 30, 1984.

Tasby v. Black Education to Maximize Education
771 F. 2d 849 (N.D. Tx. 1985); September 20, 1985.

Tasby v. Estes (Wright) (Dallas Independent School District)
630 F. Supp. 597 (N.D. Tx. 1986); February 3, 1986.

B. Unreported Opinions

Tasby v. Estes (Wright) (Dallas Independent School District)
August 2, 1971

Tasby v. Estes (Wright) (Dallas Independent School District)

August 12, 1971.

Tasby v. Estes (Wright) (Dallas Independent School District) August 17, 1971.

Tasby v. Estes (Wright) (Dallas Independent School District) August 20, 1971.

Tasby v. Estes (Wright) (Dallas Independent School District) September 4, 1971.

Tasby v. Estes (Wright) (Dallas Independent School District) March 10, 1976. (Opinion and Order)

Tasby v. Estes (Wright) (Dallas Independent School District) April 7, 1976. (Final Order)

Tasby v. Estes (Wright) (Dallas Independent School District) February 1, 1982. (Order)

C. Other Documents

Dallas Alliance, "Synopsis of (1974) Plan." (No Date)

Dallas Independent School District, "Effects of Induced Desegregation." (No Date)

Dallas Independent School District, "Induced Desegregation: Its Effect on Student Achievement and Population Resegregation," September1973.

Dallas Independent School District, "Longitudinal Effects of Desegregation 1972–1975," July, 1975.

Dallas Independent School District, "Student Assignment Plan Carrying into Effect the Concept of the Educational Task Force of the Dallas Alliance," March 22, 1976.

Dallas Independent School District, "Desegregation in the DISD: An Historical Perspective," July, 1978.

Albert, G., H. White and Paul Geisel, "Dallas, Texas: The Intervention of Business Leaders," in C. Willie and S. Greenblatt (Eds.), *Community Politics and Educational Change* (1981).

ECTOR, TX

A. Reported Opinions

United States v. Ector County Independent School District 722 F. 2d 1182 (5th Cir. 1983); December 29, 1983.

B. Unreported Opinions

United States v. Ector County Independent School District August 6, 1982. (Plan)

United States v. Ector County Independent School District
March 27, 1984.

EL PASO, TX

A. Reported Opinions

Alvarado v. El Paso Independent School District
326 F. Supp. 674 (W.D. Tx. 1971); March 8, 1971.

Alvarado v. El Paso Independent School District
445 F. 2d 1011 (5th Cir. 1971); June 16, 1971.

Alvarado v. El Paso Independent School District
426 F. Supp. 575 (W.D. Tx. 1976); December 23, 1976. (Plan)

Alvarado v. El Paso Independent School District
593 F. 2d 577 (5th Cir. 1979); April 5, 1979.

FORT WORTH, TX

A. Reported Opinions

Flax v. Potts (Fort Worth)
333 F. Supp. 711 (N.D. Tx. 1970); August 28, 1970.

Flax v. Potts (Fort Worth)
450 F. 2d 1118 (5th Cir. 1971); June 15, 1971.

Flax v. Potts (Fort Worth)
464 F. 2d 865 (5th Cir. 1972); July 14, 1972.

Flax v. Potts (Fort Worth)
567 F. Supp. 859 (N.D. Tx. 1983); June 17, 1983.

B. Unreported Opinions

Flax v. Potts (Fort Worth)
July 30, 1971. (Memorandum Opinion)

Flax v. Potts (Fort Worth)
July 14, 1972.

Flax v. Potts (Fort Worth)
August 23, 1973. (Order)

C. Other Documents

United States District Court, Northern District of Texas, "Order on Plan for Desegregation," May 8, 1963.

HOUSTON, TX

A. Reported Opinions

Ross v. Eckles (Houston Independent School District)
317 F. Supp. 512 (S.D. Tx. 1970); May 30, 1970. (Plan)

Ross v. Eckles (Houston Independent School District)
434 F. 2d 1140 (5th Cir. 1970); August 25, 1970. (Plan)
Ross v. Eckles (Houston Independent School District)
468 F. 2d 649 (5th Cir. 1972); September 6, 1972.
Ross v. Eckles (Houston Independent School District)
559 F. 2d 937 (5th Cir. 1977); September 8, 1977.
Ross v. Eckles (Houston Independent School District)
457 F. Supp. 18 (S.D. Tx. 1977); December 19, 1977.
Ross v. Eckles (Houston Independent School District)
583 F. 2d 712 (5th Cir. 1978); November 6, 1978.
Ross v. Eckles (Houston Independent School District)
699 F. 2d 218 (5th Cir. 1983); February 16, 1983.

B. Unreported Opinions

Ross v. Eckles (Houston Independent School District)
May 30, 1970.
Ross v. Eckles (Houston Independent School District)
June 30, 1970. (Decree)
Ross v. Eckles (Houston Independent School District)
#September 25, 1970. (Amended Order)
Ross v. Eckles (Houston Independent School District)
May, 1975. (Amended Decree)
Ross v. Eckles (Houston Independent School District)
#July 11, 1975. (Plan)
Ross v. Eckles (Houston Independent School District)
June 10, 1979. (Memorandum and Order)
Ross v. Eckles (Houston Independent School District)
#September, 1979. (Vol. Metro Plan.)
Ross v. Eckles (Houston Independent School District)
#June 17, 1981. (Metro Suit and Unitary)
Ross v. Eckles (Houston Independent School District)
September 10, 1984. (Settlement Agreement)
Ross v. Eckles (Houston Independent School District)
November 26, 1984. (Suit Dismissed/Consent Decree)

C. Other Documents

Houston Independent School District, "Chronology of Events Relating to Civil Action 10444." (No Date)

Houston Independent School District, Task Force for Quality Integrated Education, "Report Presented to Houston Independent School District Board of Trustees," February 24, 1975.

Houston Independent School District, Task Force for Quality Integrated Education, "Report of the Houston Independent School District Administration Task Team for Quality Integrated Education," May 20, 1975.

Houston Independent School District, "Magnet School Project Evaluation Fifth Annual Report, 1979–80."

Houston Independent School District, "Inter-District Magnet System." Second Edition, May 1980.

Houston Independent School District, "Metropolitan Desegregation: A Comprehensive Status Report to the Citizens of Houston," May, 1980.

Houston Independent School District, Task Force for Quality Integrated Education, "Metropolitan Desegregation: A Comprehensive Status Report to the Citizens of Houston," May, 1980.

Houston Independent School District, "Inter-District Magnet System." Third Edition, June 1980.

Houston Independent School District, "Voluntary Inter-District Education Plan," July, 1980.

Houston Independent School District, "Voluntary Inter-District Education Plan for the Houston Metropolitan Area Tx. Education Agency," November, 1980.

Houston Independent School District, "Magnet Schools Program Summaries, 1980–1981."

Miller, Leslie, Associate Director for Instruction and Support Services. Houston Independent School District, Letter, June 24, 1981.

LUBBOCK, TX

A. Reported Opinions

United States v. Lubbock Independent School District
455 F. Supp. 1223 (N.D. Tx. 1978); January 27, 1978.

United States v. Lubbock Independent School District
600 F. 2d 518 (5th Cir. 1979); August 9, 1979.

United States v. Lubbock Independent School District
xxx F. 2d xxx (5th Cir. 1986); June 4, 1986. (State Liability)

B. Unreported Opinions

United States v. Lubbock Independent School District
May 8, 1978.

United States v. Lubbock Independent School District
April 15, 1981.

United States v. Lubbock Independent School District
July 8, 1981. (Amended Plan)

United States v. Lubbock Independent School District
July 20, 1981.

United States v. Lubbock Independent School District
November 29, 1983. (Consent Decree)

C. Other Documents

Lubbock Independent School District, "Plan of Desegregation," April 18, 1978.

Lubbock Independent School District, "Amended Plan of Desegregation," July 8, 1981.

ODESSA, TX

A. Reported Opinions

United States v. Ector County Independent School District
722 F. 2d 1182 (5th Cir. 1983); December 29, 1983.

B. Unreported Opinions

United States v. Ector County Independent School District
August 6, 1982. (Plan)

United States v. Ector County Independent School District
March 27, 1984. (Memorandum Opinion and Order)

WACO, TX

A. Reported Opinions

Arvizu v. Waco Independent School District
373 F. Supp. 1264 (W.D. Tx. 1973); April 27, 1973.

Arvizu v. Waco Independent School District
495 F. 2d 499 (5th Cir. 1974); May 17, 1974.

B. Unreported Opinions

Arvizu v. Waco Independent School District
October 14, 1983. (Plan)

D. Related Cases

United States v. Texas Education Agency (La Vega)

452 F. 2d 1203 (5th Cir. 1972); January 4, 1972.

United States v. Texas Education Agency (La Vega)
459 F. 2d 600 (5th Cir. 1972); May 10, 1972. (Annexation)

NORFOLK, VA

A. Reported Opinions

Beckett v. School Board of the City of Norfolk
302 F. Supp. 18 (E.D. Va.); May 19, 1969.

Beckett v. School Board of the City of Norfolk
308 F. Supp. 1274 (E.D. Va.); December 30, 1969.

Beckett v. School Board of the City of Norfolk
434 F. 2d 408 (4th Cir. 1970); June 22, 1970.

Beckett v. School Board of the City of Norfolk (Adams v. Orangeburg Co.)
444 F. 2d 99 (4th Cir. 1971).

Beckett v. School Board of the City of Norfolk
456 F. 2d 943 (4th Cir. 1972); March 7, 1972.

Riddick (Beckett) v. School Board of the City of Norfolk
627 F. Supp. 814 (E.D. Va.); July 9, 1984.

Riddick (Beckett) v. School Board of the City of Norfolk
784 F. 2d 521 (4th Cir. 1986); February 6, 1986.

B. Unreported Opinions

Beckett v. School Board of the City of Norfolk
August 14, 1970. (Vacated Sum Num Adams Supra.)

Beckett v. School Board of the City of Norfolk
July 28, 1971. (Memorandum Opinion)

Riddick (Beckett) v. School Board of the City of Norfolk
July 9, 1984.

ROANOKE, VA

A. Reported Opinions

Green v. School Board of the City of Roanoke
428 F. 2d 811 (4th Cir. 1970); June 17, 1970.

Green v. School Board of the City of Roanoke
316 F. Supp. 6 (W.D. Va. 1970); August 11, 1970. (Plan)

Green v. School Board of the City of Roanoke (Adams v. Orangeburg Co.)
444 F. 2d 99 (4th Cir. 1971); June 10, 1971.

Green v. School Board of the City of Roanoke

330 F. Supp. 674 (W.D. Va.); July 21, 1971.

SEATTLE, WA

A. Reported Opinions

Citizens Against Mandatory Busing v. Palmason
80 Wn. 2d 445, 495 P. 2d 657 (1972); April 6, 1972.

Washington v. Seattle School District No. 1
473 F. Supp. 966 (W.D. Wa. 1979); June 15, 1979.

Washington v. Seattle School District No. 1
633 F. 2d 1338 (9th Cir. 1980); December 16, 1980.

Washington v. Seattle School District No. 1
; June 30, 1982.

C. Other Documents

Seattle Public Schools, "The Seattle Plan for Eliminating Racial Imbalance by the 1979–80 School Year," December 13, 1977.

Seattle Public Schools, "The Seattle Plan: An Educational Opportunity 1979–80," March 19, 1979.

Seattle Public Schools, "The 1980–81 Seattle Plan: An Educational Opportunity," (1980).

Seattle Public Schools, "Welcome to Your Seattle Public Schools, 1981–82," (1981).

Siqueland, A. L., *Without a Court Order: The Desegregation of Seattle's Schools* (1981).

Maynard, W., "The Seattle Plan for Eliminating Racial Imbalance," in C. Willie (Ed.), *School Desegregation Plans That Work* (1984).

TACOMA, WA

C. Other Documents

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, "School Desegregation in Tacoma, Washington," May, 1979.

MILWAUKEE, WI

A. Reported Opinions

Amos (Armstrong) v. Board of School Directors City of Milwaukee
408 F. Supp. 765 (E.D. Wi. 1976); January 19, 1976.

Amos (Armstrong) v. Board of School Directors City of Milwaukee
408 F. Supp. 825 (E.D. Wi. 1976); February 26, 1976.

Armstrong v. Board of School Directors City of Milwaukee
416 F. Supp. 1325 (E.D. Wi. 1976); May 26, 1976.

Armstrong v. Board of School Directors City of Milwaukee
416 F. Supp. 1344 (E.D. Wi. 1976); June 11, 1976.
Armstrong v. Board of School Directors City of Milwaukee
416 F. Supp. 1347 (E.D. Wi. 1976); July 9, 1976.
Armstrong v. Brennan (Board of School Directors City of Milwaukee)
539 F. 2d 625 (7th Cir. 1976); July 23, 1976.
Armstrong v. Board of School Directors City of Milwaukee
427 F. Supp. 1377 (E.D. Wi. 1977); March 17, 1977.
Armstrong v. Brennan (Board of School Directors City of Milwaukee)
#566 F. 2d 1175 (7th Cir. 1977).
Armstrong v. O'Connell (Board of School Directors City of Milwaukee)
451 F. Supp. 817 (E.D. Wi. 1978); June 1, 1978.
Armstrong v. O'Connell (Board of School Directors City of Milwaukee)
463 F. Supp. 1295 (E.D. Wi. 1979); February 8, 1979.
Armstrong v. Board of School Directors City of Milwaukee
471 F. Supp. 800 (E.D. Wi. 1979); May 4, 1979.
Armstrong v. Board of School Directors City of Milwaukee
471 F. Supp. 827 (E.D. Wi. 1979); May 4, 1979.
Armstrong v. Board of School Directors City of Milwaukee
616 F. 2d 305 (6th Cir. 1980); February 19, 1980.
Board of School Directors City of Milwaukee v. State of Wisconsin
103 F.R.D. 596 (E.D. Wi. 1984); August 3, 1984. (Metro)

B. Unreported Opinions

Armstrong v. O'Connell et al., Milwaukee Teachers' Education Association
July 9, 1984. (Order)

C. Other Documents

Superintendent of Schools, Office of Milwaukee Public Schools, "Comprehensive Plan for Increasing Educational Opportunities and Improving Racial Balance in the Milwaukee Public Schools," December 8, 1976.

Superintendent of Schools, Office of Milwaukee Public Schools, "Preliminary Recommendations for Increasing Educational Opportunities and Improving Racial Balance," June 25, 1976.

Bennett, D., "Community Involvement in Desegregation: Milwaukee's Voluntary Plan," (1978)

Bennett, D., "The Impact of Court-Ordered Desegregation: A Defendant's View," (1979).

Brandt, M., R. Janka and H. Rose, "Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Mobilization for School and Community Cooperation," in C. Willie and S. Greenblatt (Eds.), *Community Politics and Educational Change*, (1981).

Bennett, D., "A Plan for Increasing Educational Opportunities and Improving Racial Balance in Milwaukee," in C. Willie (Ed.), *School Desegregation Plans That Work*, (1984).

State of Wisconsin (Legislative Audit Bureau), a Review of Chapter 220 Integration Aids Program, (1984).

Milwaukee Public Schools, Planning for the 1985–1986 School Year: Plans for Educational Excellence and Equity, (1984).

Milwaukee Public Schools (Division of School Services), Student Assignment Information 1985–1986, (1985).

Milwaukee Public Schools, "Catalog of Educational Opportunities for September," 1986.

Milwaukee Public Schools, "Chapter 220 Suburban School Opportunities."

Milwaukee Public Schools, "Chapter 220 Synopsis."

Milwaukee Public Schools, "Additional Suburban School Opportunities for September."

Milwaukee Public Schools, "Chapter 220 City-Suburban Transfers, 1977–1985."

☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1987-723-644/62653